The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVIII, No. 5 MAY, 1948

CONTENTS

City Priest and Country Pastor . *Bishop William O. Brady* 321

The Religion of Communism . *William J. McDonald* 326

The Resurrection of a Nation *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 341

The Ordeal of Father Wall, Part IV *Thomas Owen Martin* 350

The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church. Part III . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 361

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The *Crotalus* on Good Friday 376

The Cushion for the Cross on Good Friday . . . 376

The Relative Time of Baptism and "Churching" . . 377

Clergy *in Choro* Stand During Distribution of Communion 378

More on the Re-Burial of Veterans 378

An Organist's Problem 379

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States and Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

The Civil Official at an Invalid Marriage 380
A Problem in Justice 382
ANALECTA 384
BOOK REVIEWS
The Man on Joss Stick Alley, *by James E. Walsh* . . 392
The Saving Sense, *by Walter Dwight, S.J.* 393
Catholic Authors, *edited by Matthew Hoehn* 394
The Life of James Roosevelt Bayley, *by Sister Mary Hildegarde Yeager* 396
My Every Day Missal, *by the Monks of St. Mary's Abbey* 398
Quizzes on Hospital Ethics for Nurses, Doctors, Priests and Sisters, *by Rev. D. L. Rumble* 399
Practical Meditations for Every Day on the Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ, *by a Father of the Society of Jesus* . 399
Latin America, an Historical Survey, *by John Francis Bannon, S.J.* 400

When the Bishop comes, it is well to have at hand the

Manual of

Episcopal Visitation and Sacrament of Confirmation

Full and detailed information, both for the ceremony of Confirmation and for the Bishop's official visit. All the canonical prescriptions minutely explained. Indispensable for the occasion.

Twenty-five cents per copy
Five copies, one dollar

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

For the Sacristy and the Sanctuary

Manual of
Forty Hours' Adoration

THIS Manual Contains LITANIAE ET PRECES: the Approved Music for "Te Deum" and "Tantum Ergo," and everything requisite for the Devotion—Ceremonies, Rubrics and Prayers.

Order copies now, so that they will be on hand when needed, as they are sure to be.

Twenty-five cents per copy.
Five copies, one dollar

The Catholic University of America Press
620 Michigan Avenue, N. E.
Washington 17, D. C.

CITY PRIEST AND COUNTRY PASTOR

The title "City Priest and Country Pastor" might seem, at first thought, to imply that some great, important and even essential difference marks off the rural priest and his work from priestly life and ministrations in metropolitan centres. Indeed, one ought not, with dissimulation, blind himself to the fact that, at times, such a difference has been taken for granted. To be strictly and bluntly honest, more than one rural congregation of Catholics have voiced the desire and wish that a priest, such as Father So-and-So of a certain city parish, might be sent them, to shepherd them, as he has led his city congregation, with force and religious zeal to great material and spiritual accomplishments. In somewhat similar dreaming, perhaps, more than one priest has longed for the day of his release from a country parish, cherishing within himself the hope and expectation of a greater and better sphere of activity in town or city where Catholics are more numerous and Catholic activity more forceful. It seems equally true that a Bishop, more than once, when studying possible appointments of his priests, has, perhaps, been led in his final selection by the conviction, that whereas such a one might "do" in a country assignment, he would definitely "not do" in a fully developed city parish.

Now, certainly, all of these desires, aspirations and decisions may be subject to praiseworthy interpretations. But, like so many other things in life, they may also be less expressions of desire for new opportunities than proposals carefully calculated to bring release or escape from old situations. In such instances, if they have existed, the people may have thought more in terms of negation than of positive expectation. The rural pastor, looking city-ward, may have been so prompted more as a flight from one sort of work than as an expression of apostolic zeal for new burdens. And the Bishop, in his choice of appointments, may likewise have been influenced not so much by what was ideal for the welfare of all as by what was practically obligatory, considering the exigencies of uncontrollable circumstances.

Nevertheless, in spite of all such possible attitudes of mind, our Catholic consciousness affirms with conviction that for priest and people alike, in all essentials, spiritually, ideally, the personal pastorate of one man or another makes, or ought to make, no

essential difference in the religiousness of a community. Spiritual life depends on the good will of all and the activating power of the Holy Spirit, not on human personalities. Moreover, in accord with true supernatural principles, it is a matter of pious indifference, or should be a matter quite inconsequential, to what place a priest is assigned or by whom the assignment is made. The priest's charge is the charge of the Church; his power, the power of the Church; his personality completely and perfectly submerged in the character and personality of Christ; his work, only the immediate expression of the mind of Christ; his endeavor merely to fill up the needs of Christ and His Church.

Still, there is a reason, simple enough, why a somewhat twisted mentality, not entirely unknown in the Church, came to be, and in places, has persisted. If you will map the distribution of Catholics in our country, you will discover that in every State of the Union, we are a distinct and appallingly small minority. By States, only New Mexico, and Minnesota, and the New England country show a strong percentage of Catholics, as much as ten per cent of the community. By geographic distribution, the Catholic population is centred in the greater cities of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and in the major cities bordering on the Great Lakes. Outside of these, we are but a scattered flock. So, it is true that Catholicism has grown up in this country with a strongly urban color and trend. The first care of the Church in the Catholic history of modern America was for the great, unassimilated masses of Catholics stranded in large cities after immigration. So urgent became the need for the care of these large and centralized groups that smaller places and isolated Catholics were, for long, comparatively neglected. There still remain, even in this day, rural groups who enjoy the spiritual guidance of their priests hardly more often or under better circumstances than the new converts of China see their missionaries. In addition, until fairly modern days, the vast majority of native vocations came from the concentrated Catholic urban congregations, so that city-mindedness is a product both of circumstance and environment. We are all, doubtless, agreed that it is a city-mindedness, untested, unevaluated, even, until recently, unchallenged.

Such, however, forms no part of Catholic doctrine or principle. The truth is different and spiritually refreshing. An example will illustrate. In the City of New York, in the three boroughs of Man-

hattan, the Bronx and Richmond, there are approximately two hundred parishes. In the whole diocese of Sioux Falls, there are about one-half that many parishes with resident priests. Between these two, the great metropolis of the East and the rural, suffragan diocese of the Middle West, there can be no numerical or material comparison. One far outstrips the other in the size and capacity of churches, the range of parish facilities and equipment, the number and kind of parish activities and societies, the funded wealth and present revenue, the number of priests on duty, the beauty and distinction of the places of worship and the capacity for development in size and numbers. Yet, this difference is wholly inconsequential. What is essentially and irrevocably true is this: that any church, in any diocese, with any pastor, and with any small, no matter how small, group of parishioners, is as important in the eternal life of the Catholic Church as the great cathedral of any metropolis with multiple assistant priests and thronging crowds. To re-emphasize the reality, any priest, in any parish of any size is an essential unit in the Body that is Christ, the Church, and the work of spiritual accomplishment under his guidance in any place, however restricted, is just as vital for the spiritual progress of the Mystical Body as the greatest accomplishment of the largest parish under the most influential priestly leader. That is an assertion of superlatives. Yet, no one imbued with the spirit and the motive of Christ would dare think to the contrary, much less to assert differently. We who are priests know, with full realization, that whatever honor we have, whatever favor is ours, is not truly ours, but belongs rather to the Master who graced us with His priesthood and permits us to share in His work. Our dignity, our claim to the love and affection of our people, our duty, our devotion to priestly work arise not out of any particular assignment that we have. They flow rather from the prime and essential fact of our priesthood. Likewise, the participation of our people in the mystical living of the Lord is not dependent on time or place or circumstance of life, but rather on the simple religious reality that they are one with us, their priests, and all are one with Christ, the Lord.

If this be the basis of equality of priest with priest, Catholic people with Catholic people, rural church with urban basilica, small and limited Catholic Action with far-reaching Catholic influence, then, we might well consider whether the peculiarities of

our times have not exalted the significance of the rural priesthood and community even above the present importance of urban catholic centres. For the latter, the city parish and the city priest, labor under difficulties comparatively unknown to country communities, difficulties that tend to nullify and frustrate the best of intentions and the most devoted service. On the other hand, the rural parish and the rural priest have at their command facilities and spiritual assets and vital favorable conditions of existence not realized in more congested localities.

For example, the priest must be a leader to his people. Such is the demand of his priestly office. Yet, the unseasonable haste and multiple activities of city life tend to nullify such leadership. In the large city of today, all rush so madly that none can wait to receive direction or to question either the goal of the way. What spiritual leadership can there be with great groups pressing in and out of church each hour with no time for true religious nurture or development? What intellectual leadership can a priest bring to communities self-satisfied with the intellectual levels they have reached and often skeptical of the value of his leadership? What material direction or uplift can there be unless there be also time to visualize the future as well as the present?

Furthermore, the religious development of the Mystical Body of Christ demands an absolutely essential solidarity of priest and people. What degree of solidarity can be hoped for in the face of the pagan counter-attractions offered to religion in every city street? What unity of purpose or of effort can there be when pastor and people are practically strangers? The artificiality of life, the constant migrations of peoples, the intimate counter-influences of work and recreation in an atmosphere of irreligion, falsity or indifference make Christian solidarity a practical impossibility. Unity presupposes understanding that is mutual, a community of interests, true Christian charity. But these are contradicted in the whirl of city existence.

Again, the work of the Church is a great social action, the betterment of man, the lifting up of men from things of earth to things of Heaven. But, when men are divorced from the great realities of life, when their occupation as well as their amusement is with vain things and ephemeral, how can they be stirred with enthusiasm for great, Christian, social movements and turned from the ways of selfishness that are almost imposed by the conditions of their exist-

ence? Likewise, the work of the priest and people should be and must be one great effort of Catholic Action, constant and daily manifestation of Christ still living and working in the world among men. But this must begin with the social unit, the family, now admittedly almost totally disrupted by urban living conditions. Finally, in the personal, spiritual life of the priest, where can there be found the religious solitude essential for development of soul and mind that he may be a true leader? The demands of so many and the mechanical inventions so necessarily a part of city life allow little time and less security for peaceful meditation and study, little, even, for the official prayer of the Church, often even less for his personal association with Christ.

The obverse of this contrast presents the opportunities and possibilities of the rural priesthood. In smaller communities, the priest can be and still is the leader his office predicates. The rural parish follows a more normal and tranquil mode of life in which that leadership can be exercised. The priest there can seize native opportunities to establish and make firm the Christian solidarity so necesssary to spiritual development. There, in the rural parish, is a field of social action and Catholic Action hardly yet touched. There remain precious possibilities for personal spiritual advancement and deepening.

It is true, however, that such a picture presupposes an intense capacity for Christian vision. Priest and people, alike, (and the seminarian or religious preparing for the priesthood), must hold firm to the conviction that Catholic life does not consist in temporalities. They must actualize the truth that Catholic life does consist in Christ-like thoughts and deeds. What must be stirred in us all is the genuine religious spirit of a Curé of Ars, together with his insight, to whom a seemingly impossible parochial assignment was an opportunity and a challenge, by whose work a whole countryside was completely transformed, who is designated officially the ideal and the inspiration of every rural and every city parish priest.

✠ WILLIAM O. BRADY
Bishop of Sioux Falls

MISSION INTENTION

"That the Mother of God may lead the Children of Japan to Jesus" is the Mission Intention for the Month of May, 1948.

THE RELIGION OF COMMUNISM

The month of May, which in Catholic tradition is dedicated to Mary, serves only to call to the Communist mind recollections of the Russian revolution. This year it has a very special significance because it must be considered in conjunction with another great anniversary that is also being commemorated. Exactly a century has elapsed since the first appearance of the *Communist Manifesto* shortly before the abortive insurrection in Paris early in 1848. Its opening sentence, as is well known, contained the grim warning that "a spectre is haunting Europe, the spectre of Communism." This ghastly monster has, since that time, not only cast its sinister shadow over Europe but now threatens to darken the Americas and, indeed, the entire world. Meanwhile a vast literature exposing and analysing the economic, philosophical, and political tenets of Dialectical Materialism has developed, but its religious and theological aspects have been insufficiently stressed. Because these phases are considered to be of paramount importance, especially for the priest, an attempt is here made to fill the gap. The subject is so broad, however, that it will be possible only to indicate sources and general lines of thought which, it is hoped, may be pursued by the reader to suit his specific purpose. The general theme is that Communism is, mainly, a faith or, at least, a substitute made necessary because of the lack of faith.

In the last analysis Communism, like Catholicism, comprises two elements, a creed to be believed and a code to be practised. It is not merely a way of looking at life; it is also, and pre-eminently, a method of changing it. Not every communist comprehends the theory of Marxism any more than, unfortunately, every Catholic is familiar with the rich content of Christian truth. But the communist is not too seriously handicapped by his defective knowledge because he is prepared to accept *even what is not true* on faith and, more importantly, he is at all times ready and willing to act on his belief. He is therefore, a "dedicated" man. As Burnham puts it,

> He has no life apart from his organization and his rigidly systematic set of ideas. Everything that he does, everything that he has, family, job, money, belief, friends, talents, life, everything is subordinated to his communism. He is not a communist just on election day or at Party headquarters. He is a communist always. He eats, reads, makes love,

thinks, goes to parties, changes residence, laughs, insults, always as a communist. For him, the world is divided into just two classes of human beings: the communists, and all the rest.[1]

It is to be noted in this connection that Pope Pius XI speaks of "the new gospel which Bolshevistic and Atheistic Communism offers the world as the glad tidings of deliverance and salvation" [2] and it cannot be overemphasized that it is, first and foremost, a gospel of action. "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways," writes Marx, "the task is to change it." [3] For "in the beginning was the Word" he would substitute, as Goethe did, "In the beginning was the deed." According to Marxism only the players, not the spectators, see the game and in this sense it claims to defy logical analysis or scientific criticism. To be appreciated properly, they say, it must be seen from within. Lenin even asserts that book knowledge of Communism is useless because it only serves to perpetuate the severance between theory and practice which is the most objectionable feature of bourgeois society. "The will to revolutionary activity is a condition indispensable to the understanding of the Marxian dialectic." [4]

[1] James Burnham, *The Struggle for the World* (New York: The John Day Company, 1947), p. 59. In the "Portrait of an American Communist," in *Life* (Jan. 5, 1948), it is said that "Kelly" (the subject of the article) appreciated the similarity between the Communist Party and certain Orders of the Catholic Church "in their ruthless demands upon the individual"!

[2] Pope Pius XI, in the Encyclical *Divini Redemptoris* (p. 2 in the *N.C.W.C.* translation). It is interesting, also, that Engels in a letter to Marx, dated Nov. 24, 1847, should speak in similar terms of the *Manifesto*. "Just think over the confession of faith a little," he writes, "I believe it will be best to leave out the form of catechism and entitle the thing *The Communist Manifesto*" (*Correspondence of Marx and Engels,* I, 84).

[3] Karl Marx, "Eleventh Thesis on Feuerbach," an appendix to Engel's *Ludwig Feuerbach* (New York: International Publishers, 1934), p. 75. As Marx says in another connection, Communism without action would be like trying "to leave Catholicism extant while abolishing the Pope."

[4] Lenin, in the pamphlet, *Communism and Education*. Cf. Max Eastman, *Marxism, Is It Science* (New York: W. W. Norton Company, Inc., 1940), p. 362. The priest who experiences difficulty with prospective converts because they insist upon a rigidly rational demonstration and lack utterly the "will to believe" should readily appreciate the effectiveness of this approach. It is the equivalent of saying, "All your doubts will disappear after you have joined the Church."

One sees immediately the advantage of viewing Communism from the higher spiritual plane. But, it may be asked, how can an atheistic system be in any sense religious? The answer is to be found in what we might call the "religious incurability" of man. Louis Blanc, one of the early socialists, used to say of the Parisian reformers of his day that, since they could only conceive of a human being without religion as a monster, they said, "Donc, l'athéisme c'est votre religion!" [5] In the words of Archbishop Downey,

> . . . that a doctrine so crude, so barbarous, so irrational, so destructive of all human rights and liberties should within twenty years have secured dominion over a vast part of the human race suggests the presence behind the communist movement of a preternatural power that can be described as diabolical. [6]

It is, according to the crisp phrases of the *Divini Redemptoris* "a satanic scourge," "a false messianic idea," "a deceptive mysticism," all welded together with a peculiar singleness of aim and tinged with a redemptive fervor. Viewed merely as an economic arrangement it was not wholly unacceptable to the great Christian minds of the past. But today it is, above all, a profound and deep-seated movement of the human spirit. It is man's attempt to construct for himself a world of purely natural origins. It is, in short, the religion of anti-Christ.

It would, of course, be a serious error, theoretically and tactically, to identify Communism completely with Russia; in point of fact, its salient ideas come not from Russia but from our western world. However, it took the religious energy of the Russians, which possesses the faculty of switching over and directing itself to purposes which are not solely religious, to give Communism its dynamic force. Berdyaev, who ought to understand this mentality, says there is a nihilist basis in Lenin and, having quoted Dostoievsky to the effect that "We are all nihilists," goes on to explain that

> Russian nihilism denied God, the soul, the spirit, ideas, standards and the highest values. And none the less nihilism must be recognized

---

[5] Cf. Engel's, *op. cit.*, p. 44. Engels was quite conscious of the contribution of Catholicism. He asserts that "the periods of human development are distinguished only by religious changes," and complains that the great progress of the Middle Ages was overlooked by the philosophers of his time

[6] Quoted by Cecil J. Eustace in *Catholicism, Communism and Dictatorship* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1938), p. 98.

as a religious phenomenon. It grew up in the spiritual soil of Orthodoxy; it could only appear in a soul which was cast in the orthodox mould. It is Orthodox asceticism turned inside out, an asceticism without Grace. At the base of Russian nihilism, when grasped in its purity and depth, lies the Orthodox rejection of the world, its sense of the truth that "the whole world lieth in wickedness," the acknowledgement of the sinfulness of all riches and luxury, of all creative profusion in art and in thought. . . . Nihilism is the negative of Russian apocalyptic. It is a revolt against the injustices of history, against false civilization.[7]

Many factors are responsible for the growth of this eccentric creed but it is important to remember that in its present monstrous form it can in no way be traced to apostolic or medieval times. It is rather the product of an age that was losing the faith, that witnessed a breakdown of the organic unity of Christendom and a resulting breach between religion and life. Communism is simply a crude attempt to fill the vacuum, to regain the lost unity and brotherhood of the days of faith. Beginning in Rationalism, it was fostered by such creeds as Calvinism, which may be said to have been a religion of sanctified prosperity.

It grips men's minds and inspires both preaching and practice, as Calvinism did. And the Marxist belief in predetermined process is parallel to the Calvinist insistence on God's absolute sovereignty. Marxism is, in fact, Calvinism secularised, and yet not completely secularised, for submission to a process may have something of the mystic quality of submission to the will of God.[8]

In Communism as in Calvinism

. . . the notion of an elect plays a cardinal rôle, both theoretical and practical. . . . The believer is placed in impregnable security; he has the truth by faith and scripture; and it is a higher truth, whose service

---

[7] *The Origin of Russian Communism* (London: The Centenary Press. 1937), pp. 48 f.

[8] H. G. Wood, *Christianity and Communism* (New York: The Round Table Press, 1933), pp. 3 f. Marx himself pays an indirect, perhaps left-handed, tribute to Catholicism when, referring to his *bête noire* in *Das Kapital*, he writes that "For a society of this type, Christianity, with its cult of the abstract human being, is the most suitable religion—above all, Christianity in its bourgeois phases of development, such as Protestantism, Deism, and the like." *Capital*, translated by E. and C. Paul (London: Everyman Edition, 1930), I, 53. Cf. also Engels' letter to Schmidt, Oct. 27, 1890.

imposes a peculiar discipline and in return confers a peculiar emancipation. The psychological gratification thus offered is immense; it constitutes the magnetic element in the evangelism of all closed systems.[9]

Somebody has well said that all speculative philosophers are priests in disguise. Certainly the doctrine of materialism and conflict taught by Hobbes; the deification of abstraction as exemplified in Descartes; the transformation of society by the activization of the masses, as illustrated in the French revolution; the optimistic and secular faith, dating back to Rosseau, that man's shortcomings are not rooted in his nature but in objective and remediable conditions; the peculiar trust in science so predominant in the nineteenth century; and, finally, the socio-economic creed of classical Liberalism, which is expressly mentioned as a cause by Pope Pius XI; all these factors and phenomena conspired to bring about a reaction in the shape of the surging, quasi-religious idealism called scientific socialism and it is significant that its founder, St. Simon, should write a work entitled, *The New Christianity,* just as Comte invented his new Religion of Humanity. All represented a revolt against the gigantic injustices of a pharisaical society that had almost cast off its Christian heritage; but not, however, completely, for the very response to the Marxian protest required some lingering sense of Christian values. Trotsky wrote, "To sanctify the individual we must destroy the social order which crucifies that individual. This task can only be fulfilled by blood and iron." When there are great inequalities in society, when souls become surfeited with material accessories, then inevitably occurs a movement toward the reorganization of culture as a whole. The only really effective revolution is in the Christian manner of a change from within but, failing this, men seek an escape by endeavoring to transform the outer structure. In Communism an attempt is made to achieve some semblance of harmony on a lower key. As Proudhon noted, every political question involves a question in theology. In the medieval age social and economic problems were interpreted in the light of theology; the Marxist, on the

[9] W. A. Orton, *The Liberal Tradition,* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1945), pp. 83 f.

contrary, translates theology into terms of social and economic needs.[10]

Marx, in addition to his general thesis that the mode of production determines the general character of the social, political, and spiritual processes of life, brings this out clearly in a famous passage worth quoting in full.

> The struggle against religion is therefore, indirectly, the struggle against that world whose spiritual aroma is religion. Religious misery is at once the expression of real misery and a protest against that real misery. Religion is the sigh of the hard-pressed creature, the sentiment of a heartless world, as it is the soul of soulless circumstances. It is the opium of the people. . . . Religion is the illusory sun which revolves around man so long as he does not revolve around himself. It is, therefore, the task of history to establish the truth of this life after the otherworldliness of truth has disappeared. It is first of all the task of philosophy, in the service of history, to expose self-alienation in its unholy forms after the holy form of human self-alienation has been exposed. The criticism of heaven thus transforms itself into the criticism of earth, the criticism of religion into the criticism of law, the criticism of theology into the criticism of politics.[11]

Some writers have striven to find parallels on the theological plane between Communism and Catholicism.[12] Both call for the overcoming of the state of nature by a higher condition. They have their Paradise Lost and their Paradise Regained. Pre-socialist man equals unredeemed man; classless man is redeemed man; the classless society is the Kingdom of God. The Holy Trinity has been compared to the triadic movement of the Marxian dialectic. In the Godhead is thesis, antithesis, and synthesis; "there unity, dilating, eternally begets variety; and variety, condensing, is eternally re-

[10] See in this connection the profound but little-known treatise of the brilliant Spanish thinker, Donoso Cortes, translated by William McDonald under the title *Essays on Catholicism, Liberalism, and Socialism* (Dublin: Wm. B. Kelly, 1874). The first chapter of this work is especially pertinent to our matter.

[11] Marx, *"A Critique of the Hegelian Philosophy of Right,"* in *Selected Essays of Marx* (New York: International Publishers, 1926), p. 16.

[12] Cf. Miller, *The Christian Significance of Karl Marx* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1947); De la Saudée-Dingle, *Communism and Anti-Religion* (New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons, 1937); Lampert, *Nicolas Berdyaev and the Middle Ages* (London: James Clark and Co., no date); as well as the works of Berdyaev himself and those of Christopher Dawson.

solved into unity."[13] Lenin is the messiah of the new religion; Marx and Engels are its prophets. It has its bible in *Das Kapital*; its orthodox doctrine in Leninist-Marxism; its heretics such as Zenovieff and Trotsky; its apostles of the type of Kautsky and Doriot. Communism, too, claims universality in its appeal—"Workers of the world, unite!"—and the proletariat is called upon to deliver not only itself but mankind. It is authoritarian, even infallible. Typical is the response of Willian Z. Foster who, when asked in a radio debate if he had ever "condemned, criticized, or found fault with anything that Stalin has ever enuntiated from Moscow," replied, "The Soviet policy is the correct policy, and why should I criticize it."[14] Everything not in line with its policies is damned as heresy or fascism. It creates a conscience in its followers about bringing its gospel to all who supposedly need it and in this respect it is interesting to note how it is possible sometimes to develop a certain sense of rectitude even where it involves the commission of crime. Finally, it has its secular eschatology with its judgment and liquidation of the sinning capitalist exploiters and its ultimate promise of an idyllic society, a veritable heaven upon earth. In this vision Marx was true to his own racial and religious background. Although baptized he never lost the traditional Jewish sense of messianic expectation.

These resemblances do indeed indicate that Communism is concerned with nothing short of final things. In other words, it is a religion in its essence opposed at every point to supernatural religion divinely revealed. It would be a comparatively easy task to demonstrate its weakness academically but, unfortunately—and precisely because it is a faith—it is not disposed of by the mere assertion that it is false. Its thesis may be disproved while its bitterness increases. It is conceivable that one may even win an argument and at the same time lose a soul. Theoretically, assuming its premises, its logic may be rigid but Micklem's words remain true, that

> . . . an economic materialism that denies the idea of God, that gives no abiding value to human life, and that represents history as the unfolding of inexorable laws could not in logic evoke any strenuous activity.

---

[13] Donoso Cortes, *op. cit.*, p. 31.

[14] *Are Communism and Democracy Mutually Antagonistic* (New York: The Catholic Information Society, 1946), p. 19.

But in fact the Communist ideal has kindled in the young of this generation a boundless enthusiasm and has carried many to heroic sacrifice. Atheistic Communism, in despite of logic, and to the vast inconvenience of well-established political parties has become a pseudo-religion. Not as a political or economic theory but as a religion it compels the devotion of its adherents.[15]

Communism works like a fever in the veins of the youthful and the eager. It communicates the will to serve and inspires, apparently, a great sense of exhilaration. It makes all alien to itself seem mean and unimportant. It has caught a spark of religious fire and this explains its prevailing power and advantage over the other political and social systems of our time. The creed and chief impulses of a society in a sense defy analysis but one thing is certain, the core of the present crisis is spiritual. It is a religious struggle though couched in political and economic terms. Communism, although in fact it destroys the sanctification of life, has attempted to manufacture a new social gospel on the basis of blind faith. Its leaders, despite their shortcomings, did succeed in diagnosing correctly the disease of our age. They viewed the frightful shipwreck of souls, saw the masses living in fear and insecurity, lethargic peoples, perhaps, but with their eyes nevertheless fixed on the stars. They saw man thrown back upon himself, with nothing to hold on to, his spirit languishing because he could no longer contemplate divine things and so they offered him a coerced creed. Its acceptance involves a crucial decision but, after all, what other means are left whereby to achieve some kind of unity, or at least uniformity, after standards have disappeared? At any rate, the willingness of so many to follow its leaders is not based on any conviction regarding the rightness of the new order but on faith, on a secularized desire for salvation. It is indeed "seduction by the absurd," based on the truism that any solution is better than none. Some, no doubt, accept it honestly and sincerely, not realizing that disbelief in God necessarily strangles belief in man. As Zosima says of a similiar type in Dostoievsky's *The Brothers Karamazov,* "They mean to build justly: but, denying Christ, they will end by spilling blood over the whole earth."

Whatever purports to be of good in the communist faith is derived from Christianity although, of course, in distorted form

[15] Micklem, *The Theology of Politics* (Oxford: The Oxford University Press, 1941), p. xiii.

or as a sort of caricature. Where else could they get their ideas of brotherhood, of equal worth, of supra-nationalism, of the communion of men in one body? Forged in a furnace of doubt and disillusionment, born of a world that had indulged in a wholesale unmasking of values and debunking of dogmas, that had isolated religion from social and economic life, it simply fed on some of the elements of a Christianity that was being discarded. It came at a time when there was a descent into despair, a veritable dark night of the soul. Individualism was rampart even in the domain of religion itself. With immortality gone, no prospect of a higher existence, the human person was plunged into the limbo of gloomy realities. Thus he became an easy prey to dark forces. But clamoring as he does not only for society but for community—what the Russians call *sobernost*—he will not long endure such intolerable isolation. He needs at least Karl Jasper's "fictitious élan of pretended convictions." Consequently, nothing remained but for political action to take over the priestly function of defending the spirit and the destiny of man. Thus it was that the communists were able to cause such a tremendous upsurge, that they could press their claims to be the bearers of a gospel to mankind. Thus it was that Moscow again aspired to become the third Rome.

But precisely because it is a faith Communism, now swept along by the momentum of its initial drive and fanaticism, must eventually collapse. The realization of its aims demands a religious energy of the spirit and a capacity for sacrifice. When the religious springs have dried up and the religious flame is quenched whence shall it derive its force? Its bread is an earthly bread; its grace does not emanate from God; its inward principle, disbelief in the divine and in the immortality and freedom of the human soul, is self-destructive. There will be a negation of this negation. Communism is succumbing to the three temptations Our Lord refused, of stones turned into bread, of the kingdoms of this world, of the social miracle.[16] It cannot continue to coerce the mind and soul because, actually, it has no interest in the human person. It can give him a temporary sedative for the spiritual life—Communism itself is the real opium of the people—but it is unable to offer any genuine spiritual sustenance. It beckons to conquest here but, and

[16] Cf. Berdyaev, *Dostoievsky*, translated by Donald Attwater (London: Sheed and Ward, 1934), p. 196.

this is one of its greatest defects, it has no victory over death. Both it and its adherents must perish. This fact should be emphasized more and more. Psychologically and otherwise, it is much better to stress the eventual collapse of Communism than to call attention to its continued success.

But what will succeed it? An order based upon cut-throat rivalry and sharp practice, a cruel grasping creed that is often labelled "vigorous competition," a welfare society of merely humanitarian services, of works without faith? No, Communism will not be finally exterminated by this coldly philanthropic type of industrial capitalism because they are of the same flesh and blood, both worshipping the socio-economic order. That would be hiring Beelzebub to drive out the devil. Communism is, at root, counter-Christ but the rule of Mammon is also a betrayal of Christ. The mysticism of money or of power is not any more justifiable because it happens to be sugar-coated; nor is Communist atheism any more reprehensible than Capitalist atheism. It is so easy to set up scapegoats for our sins. Communism, like every revolution, is a judgment of God upon us the living and instead of being professional anti-Communists and taking the attitude of the Pharisee each one should rather beat his breast and cry, *Mea culpa!* It is truly a sad commentary on any generation when the extermination of the adversary appears as the only salvation.

Instead of being hypotized by the power of the communists, as so many seem to be, we should try to develop a positive constructive attitude about it. It is their aim to smother the spiritual man and to paralyze the Christian conscience. Rather than be merely anti-Communist we should be opposed to the type of society that made such an evil and vicious thing possible. We must not cling on to disintegrating tendencies, to decaying institutions. The communists must not be allowed to wrest from us our traditional rôle as defenders of human liberty, for the roots of a free society are fixed forever in the soil of Christianity. Therefore, we must oppose all forms of rank materialism. The road to liberty is not in the further deification of man but in the re-discovery of God. We must meet the dynamic of world communism with a re-energized Christianity. Only thus shall we draw the teeth of this monster and check its Luciferian drive. Have we lost altogether the spirit of conquest? The struggle today calls for the courage of the crusaders.

God wills it. We must recapture the holy land of Christian ideals; we must help in the supreme task of bringing the faith back even to Russia and the communist dominated countries. The totalitarian State can indeed absorb the secondary activities of the Church but it can never compete with it on its own ground, which lies at a deeper level of man's being.

The fact that Stalin has lately found it necessary to issue orders relative to the re-appearance of religion amongst his henchmen speaks volumes. Moreover, recent reports coming from Eastern Europe tell of a real underground, of a vibrant, pulsating Catholicism remarkably like that of the early Christians. The Church has once more gone down into the catacombs and whenever that occurs we may be sure that new life is stirring, that a second spring is at hand. These "silent" people clandestinely cherish a sacred fire of ethical and spiritual values and our best interests as well as those of our country and of civilization itself lie in giving them not only physical but mental, moral, and spiritual support. Some of our fellow Christians make an unfortunate mistake in their attempts to condone and compromise. Experience shows that where Communists attain control they are ruthlessly opposed to all forms of Christianity, no matter how weak or watered down they may be. On the other hand, many Russian writers of the nineteenth century, such as Soloviev, were convinced that their country would be instrumental in bringing Christianity back to the western world. Chaadaev, the first Russian historical philosopher, was very sympathetic with Roman Catholicism and saw in it the salvation of Russia. May it not be that God is using the hatred of the Communists for our lukewarm liberal society to renew the life of grace within us, to whip complacent Christians into a keener sense of their obligations? As St. Augustine showed, this would only confirm the fact of divine omnipotence, since God alone is great and forceful enough to draw good out of evil.

The Communists often put even Catholics to shame in the matter of heroic living. There is only one way to meet such a challenge and that is by more heroic living. Communism is not like the other heresies of history; it unites and combines all the errors of the past. Christian civilization has never met a keener, a more irreconcilable foe. We are face to face with total paganism and total paganism cannot be conquered by half-hearted Christianity.

It can be overthrown only by total Christianity, by the type of Christianity exemplified by the original disciples, these early athletes of Christ who, with hearts burning with the Spirit of truth and of love, went out and converted a world startingly akin to our own. Man's extremity is God's opportunity. What is needed are real apostles of prayer, of action, and of example because the great task today is not only to introduce Christianity to those outside the household of the faith but also to help restore Christianity to Christendom itself, especially to those who, as Pope Pius XI says, are "Catholics hardly more than in name."[17] To be effective our longing for a newer and better world must be quickened and empowered by a passionate personal loyalty to Christ and a devotion to the Will of God.

It is not just a question of opposing Communists; the problem is to convert them. If theirs is a religion in disguise then, possibly, we can help them to throw off the mask and make it a faith clean and undefiled. May we not work on the assumption that it is simply misdirected energy, misguided zeal, an unconscious groping for the divine? After all a criminal crucified with Christ was saved; the persecutor Saul became the great St. Paul. Undoubtedly many a Communist must feel as Engels did when he wrote: "I pray every day. . . . I feel that I will not be lost, that I will find God, toward Whom I aspire with all my heart."[18]

It is sometimes forgotten that the Hound of Heaven is pursuing them too; that they are not necessarily cast out forever. It is remarkable how in the recent past intellectual leaders have been the first to betray their mission and the pauper's broth of electicism that is being ladled out in some of our institutions of higher learning, instead of helping the younger intelligentsia in the search for truth, has rather prepared their minds for the reception of diabolical propaganda. "The preachers of communism," says the Holy Father, "exploit the lack of orientation characteristic of modern agnostic science in order to burrow into the universities." [19]

The communists enjoy a tremendous advantage; they are welded together by a common faith and a common purpose whereas others—at least outside the Catholic fold—have none. One some-

[17] Cf. Pope Pius XI, *op cit.*, p. 30.

[18] Eastman, *op. cit.*, p. 352.

[19] Pope Pius XI, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

times wonders if even Catholics are sufficiently conscious of their unity and their God-given responsibility in this respect. For this a partial remedy, at least, may be found in the parish study club devoted to social problems. Even though a positive exposition of say, the principles contained in the Encyclicals is to be preferred it will be found more interesting to present them against the background of the Communist challenge. At any rate, it is not too much to expect that our people should have some special preparation to meet the greatest single anti-Christian force of their generation. "We cherish the hope", says Pius XI, "that the fanaticism with which the sons of darkness work day and night at their materialistic and atheistic propaganda will at least serve the holy purpose of stimulating the sons of light to a like and even greater zeal for the honor of the Divine Majesty." [20]

In conclusion, since Communism is a religion in disguise it can be met effectively only on the religious level. The only real ringing answer to its challenge is to meet faith with faith. What is at stake is not a form of government or an economic system but simply the human soul.[21] Even greater and more frequent use is to be encouraged of the channels whereby supernatural life flows into humanity, transforming and renewing it from within as the divine seed of a new spiritual creation. Otherwise a godless generation must end in savagery and massacre. Whether or not a third world war becomes necessary—and we pray God it may be averted—the more subtle and dangerous, because spiritual, conflict is now being waged. And "our wrestling is not with flesh and blood but with principalities and powers, with the rulers of the world of darkness, with the spirit of wickedness in high places." [22]

Therefore a sure protection requires taking on the armor of God, the breast plate of justice, and the sword of the spirit. Somehow or other, our fellow-citizens, all men of good will, must be aroused and their support enlisted on this clear and compelling issue. They must be made to understand in this critical hour that they are not free to serve God as they like but only as God likes. The general assumption is that poverty and starvation breed communists. These,

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

[21] Cf. Christopher Dawson, "The Foundations of Unity," in the *Dublin Review* for October, 1942, p. 100.

[22] *Eph.* 6: 12-14.

however, are not the only causes. They do not, for instance, explain such cases as that of the Hollywood writers recently arraigned before Congress. Undoubtedly many today embrace Communism because of a bad conscience. They seek to vent a corporate hatred against the Church. Here is perhaps the most self-destructive element in the whole system. We have seen already that their refusal to take death seriously means a lack of reverence for life and consequently a general failure in compassion and consideration for individuals. But it is hate that will eventually consume them.

The poisonous virulence of such denunciations as that attributed to Lunatcharsky, Commissar of Public Education, in a Moscow speech is both shocking and startling to the Catholic concience.

> We hate Christianity and Christians; even the best of them must be looked upon as our worst enemies. They preach the love of our neighbors and mercy, which is contrary to our principles. Christian love is an obstacle to the development of the revolution. Down with the love of our neighbor! What we need is hate. It is only by learning to hate that we can hope to conquer the world.[23]

Meanwhile the true Christian must meet hate with love.

It is well to remember, also, that educated women are called in a special way by the present Pontiff to play their rôle in social and political life. The Communists are sadly lacking a philosophy of womanhood because they do not know Mary through whose gentle influence and example all women are capable of co-operating in the new redemption by bringing out the graciousness and fineness in men's souls in which lies the hope of the world. The Communists have indeed a faith, they even offer a certain kind of hope but they miss the greatest virtue of all, charity. They must be brought to know Crucified Love, which compels or oppresses no one, which must be accepted freely. And love will conquer even in apparent failure as it once did upon the Cross. It is in this great mission of showing forth the living charity of Him Who said, "I am come to cast fire upon the earth," that all are called upon to play a part. In words of the greatest, because supreme spiritual, leader of our age, Pope Pius XII: "The time for reflection and planning is past.

[23] Report of the Rev. E. I. Walsh to the Catholic Press Congress in Brussels, Sept. 2, 1930. Cf. De la Saudée-Dingle, *op. cit.*, p. 7.

The opposing fronts in the religious and moral fields are becoming ever more clearly defined. The time of test is here." For those who may be somewhat discouraged by the prospect perhaps the best advice is that contained in the discourse of his saintly predecessor, Pius X, on the occasion of the beatification of Joan of Arc:

"To the politicians who declare a war to the death with the Church after having denounced her as an enemy, to the sectaries who are never tired of vilifying and calumniating her with a hellish hatred, to the false champions of science who set out to make her odious through their sophisms, by accusing her of being the enemy of liberty, civilization, and intellectual progress, answer boldly that the Catholic Church, the mistress and queen of souls, dominates the world because she is the Bride of Christ."

WILLIAM J. MCDONALD

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE CHURCH MILITANT

. . . The long and stubborn struggle in the Empire for and against Arianism, which is so deplorable a phenomenon in the midst of the contemporaneous triumph of Christianity over Paganism, is nothing less than one passage in the history of the perpetual conflict, which has ever been waged, and which ever will be waged, between the Church and the secular power; and was that particular stage of it, which followed in natural course on the termination of the persecutions—the secular power, when foiled in its efforts to subdue the Church from without, next attempting, by entering her pale, to master her from within. It was a new thing in Greece and Rome that religion should be independent of state authority, and the same principle of Government which led the emperors to denounce Christianity, while they were pagans, led them to dictate to its bishops, when they had become Christians. Accordingly, a second conflict was inevitable, whatever might be the shape which it assumed, or the issue upon which it turned. In any case it would be fierce and world-wide.

—John Henry Cardinal Newman, in *Tracts Theological and Ecclesiastical* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1895), pp. 142 f.

THE RESURRECTION OF A NATION

A few months ago a noteworthy book, entitled *France Alive,* made its appearance from the pen of Mrs. Claire Bishop, a lady of French birth, who for many years has been living in the United States.[1] Her theme is the spiritual revival that she believes is taking place in her native land. She asserts that her account is based on what she herself has seen and heard in the course of two lengthy visits she made to France since the close of World War II. The consistency and sincerity with which she writes induce the reader to accept her statements as a reliable account, free from conscious exaggeration and misleading dramatization. In the Preface she herself expresses the hope that the reader will not be tempted either to generalize from her experiences or to minimize them, but will merely take them as indications of what is going on in France.

The revival which Mrs. Bishop describes is manifesting itself in many ways. One of the most striking is the endeavor of many priests to get closer to the working classes by taking jobs as manual laborers—factory workers, miners, longshoremen, etc.—which will necessarily bring them into daily contact with the proletariat. The results of this method, according to Mrs. Bishop, are generally most encouraging, in that even those who are not practicing Catholics manifest a new attitude of friendly respect in place of the scorn which they formerly had for the clergy. Speaking of a group of priests who adopted this method—a "team" as she calls them—Mrs. Bishop narrates: "It seemed, then to the team, as it did to others, that in order to break down prejudices, rehabilitate manual work (Christ Himself had done manual work) and redeem the Church in the eyes of the workingman, the only thing to do was for the priests to make their own living by manual labor." [2]

Some of these priests choose a form of manual labor with the intention of retaining it the rest of their lives. They live in humble dwellings in the workers' quarters as a group, or board in the houses of other workers. Both secular and religious priests are among them. When the day's work is ended they perform their priestly functions

[1] *France Alive.* By Claire Huchet Bishop. New York: The Declan X. McMullen Co. Inc., 1947. Pp. xi + 227. $3.00.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 60.

and devotions. Apparently they must have a special privilege in the matter of the eucharistic fast, for the author speaks of the celebration of Mass when the priest returns from work in the evening. It seems quite ordinary, too, for a priest to celebrate the Holy Sacrifice in private homes, and a familiar talk about the message of the Gospel with the congregation joining in seems to take the place of a formal sermon.

There are also various organizations of the laity very active in the promotion of this revival, such as the JOC (Jeunesse Ouvrière Catholique), the JAC (Jeunesse Agricole Catholique) and the MPF (Mouvement Populaire des Familles). One of their main objectives is to foster "communal life" which would seem to be the Christian ideal of what Communists propose as their goal. In this movement the first endeavor is to make people aware of their obligation to help their fellowmen; and it is the conviction of the promoters that even if those who can be induced to do this do not practice religion in the beginning they will be brought to it eventually. They aim at an adequate distribution of the goods of the earth, and believe that through the exercise of the "communal" spirit, which is a part of the message of Christianity, the participants will eventually be brought to the practice of the entire message. Mrs. Bishop expresses this idea in these words:

> How long the country population will remain in this intermediary Christian stage is a question the Catholic workers do not ask themselves. They trust the power of the Spirit, and they know from experience that at first the ways of grace are often disconcerting. They labor, pray, partake of the Holy Eucharist themselves and leave the rest to God. Whenever the "new" Christians come to use the sacraments, it is because they feel the need of them and wish to bring Christ—whose boundless fraternal message they have so readily grasped—more fully to the community.[3]

One of the unfortunate features of ecclesiastical administration in France, according to Mrs. Bishop, has been the methods of securing financial support for the Church. Thus, there were various grades of marriage and funeral ceremonies, differing in solemnity and accessories. The more elaborate were the "trimmings," the larger was the stipend. Undoubtedly, one of the results of such a system was the widespread impression that the Church does not esteem the

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 88.

poor as highly as the rich. Mrs. Bishop relates the story of one parish priest who eliminated this system—with the permission of the bishop, who told him: "It is at your own risk." The priest summoned to a meeting all the baptized living within his parochial territory, whether they were practicing Catholics or not, and addressed them thus:

Do you want to know why we priests have become merchants? When Church and State were separated, we lost our heads. Instead of truly relying on God, we preferred to arrange our little material life in our own way. And we did. Very well. So much for the carpet. So much for the hangings. So much for the organ. So much for a low Mass. So much for a high Mass. It is to our shame that we did not rely on God. From now on we are going to rely on Him in this parish. I do not mean to say that you should not give anything, but whatever you give will be entirely voluntary. It will be your offering to the family life. Of course, those who can't pay, don't pay. Each person offers what he can, through love of the community. If you are wealthy, you are only the steward of your riches. Use them; do not misuse them. Offer them in place of someone who can't offer anything. But everybody will have the same ceremonies.[4]

Mrs. Bishop's final comments on this subject give food for thought to all priests, even though they refer directly only to the clergy of France:

If the parish church continues to exact money from the workers, it will never bridge the gap between them and the priests. Regardless of the liturgical and biblical renewal, it will never become the center of expression of Christian communal life. The parish church will be on one side, the workers on the other. It will never be their church, their house, the house of God.[5]

A deep interest in the liturgy is also being aroused. Priests go all over France, explaining the Mass, spending a week in each town. The origin of the Holy Sacrifice, the meaning of the vestments, the method of participation by the faithful form the subject of their discourses each evening. We are told:

Everywhere in France where there were communal Masses the spirit was the thing. Methods varied. One congregation could answer in Latin. In another church the priest officated at the altar in Latin, while another

---

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 102.

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

priest dialogued the Mass in French with the people. Elsewhere the people could recite part of the Mass in Latin, like the *Credo*, but had to dialogue the *Introibo* with another priest in French. Of course, nothing is done that is contrary to canonical rules.[6]

Extra-liturgical functions promote the communal Christian spirit and the revival of Catholic life. Among these are the Festival of the Missions, Mother's Day, the Festival of Baptism (the occasion being collective baptism) and the Gospel Festival (at which the choir, in company with the deacon, sings answers to the burning questions of the day, the words being taken directly from the Gospel). In some "revitalized" parishes a child will not be admitted to solemn First Communion (an event desired by all French families, even when they have ceased to be practical Catholics) unless the parents promise to help the child keep his promise to live as a Christian.

An interesting type of seminary life is described in Chapter IX, as the author observed it in the Seminary of the Mission of France. This institution was founded in 1941, primarily to supply the needs of the people in country parishes, where priests are sometimes lacking, but are now intended for the spiritual necessities of the cities also. The curriculum is adapted to the idea that France is a mission country, so that priests must be trained for its particular needs. So many young men are applying for admission that it is impossible to provide accommodations for all. One of the methods utilized by the graduates of this seminary is the "trailer mission." A priest engaged in this form of apostolic work thus describes the method:

> We sell books and popular editions of the Gospel. Then we co-operate with the parish priests, helping them rethink their parish work. We go over their programs and plan visits, meetings, festivals. We give many festivals—out of doors when the weather permits. We divide the parish among the team members and go visiting from door to door. No money. Just friendly visits. We talk over everything, whatever is on the people's minds. And we tell them that we are always at home in the evening. They can drop in whenever they want to. Men like the idea, and visitors crowd the trailer living room every night.[7]

Several new and extraordinary religious institutes are also products of the spiritual revival of France. In the light of the tradi-

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 142.

tional religious life, their customs appear startling. Les Petites Soeurs du Père de Foucauld work in factories, though they live in common. Since some of them are sent to Africa to work among the Moslems, they are trained to recite community prayers in Arabic, and even to prostrate themselves before the Blessed Sacrament after the manner of the Moslems. There is also an order of "Carmelites in the World," all of whom work as teachers, secretaries, factory workers, etc. Mrs. Bishop tells us that these nuns have no set rules and no formal vows, but merely renew their baptismal vows after three years of noviciate. However, they then must give their worldly possessions to other people and retain nothing save a capacity for work. The author tells us: "The Carmelites in the World are very hospitable and they have a great variety of dinner guests. They are frightened of nobody, regardless of profession or ideology. Even so, they might have a harder time balancing on their tightrope if the Dominicans and the hierarchy had not been moved to give them friendly and powerful support." [8]

Chapter X describes a group of one hundred families dwelling at Boimondau under a voluntary communal system, by which everyone receives a measure of compensation from the community for his contribution to the communal life. Even the housewife is paid for her homemaking; children are paid, for their work is to grow; the sick are paid for their work is to get well; old people will be paid, for their work will be to retell their experiences and to give advice. Mrs. Bishop tells us that the Boimondau idea is spreading, and that even some owners of industries are in favor if it. She quotes one of these owners as follows:

> We discussed and appropriated the ethical concepts of the Boimondau group, and adopted their system of remuneration and most of their principles and practices of life. The educational aspects particularly appealed to the men. Some of them could not read; others wanted to learn mathematics and mechanical drawing and various technical subjects. As in Boimondau, the educational program was incorporated in the working hours and the men were paid at the same rate. . . .It is now a pleasure to work with the men. They don't come late any more, they're happy as larks, anxious to work and looking for improvements in their way of life.[9]

---

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 169.

There is also a spiritual revival among Protestants, we are told. There is even a form of monastic life adopted by a group of Calvinists at Cluny, near the site of the great medieval monastery; and they spend their day in prayer and manual labor.

The chapter entitled "The Great Return" is most inspiring. It deals with the revival of devotion to Our Lady. We are told that "ten million French people have offered themselves to Christ through their consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Their written pledges are housed in a shrine. There are many more who have not signed pledges, but who have been awakened to a new spiritual life." [10] In 1946 a remarkable religious demonstration took place in Paris, attended by 120,000 persons, of whom 85,000 received Holy Communion. Mrs. Bishop concludes: "The vast throng moved homeward. It was well past midnight. There was no transportation. The people walked through the suburbs, through sleeping Paris. Sleepers were awakened by the sound of the immense shuffling and opened their shutters. 'What is it? A revolution?' Yes, a revolution. The only revolution." [11]

That a religious revival was sorely needed in France is undeniable. Unbelief and indifference to Catholicism had become deeply engrained in a nation where the life of faith was once so flourishing. Do the incidents described by Mrs. Bishop indicate that the needed revival has begun? We should hope and pray that it is so, for a vigorous Catholic spirit is called for if France is to be preserved from the subservient influences that seem to be concentrating so intensely on that land. We cannot doubt that the hand of God is guiding those who are striving to inaugurate this spiritual renovation, and that the activities described in *France Alive* (or, at least, many of them) are visible manifestations of the divine life that still thrives in the French nation as a whole, despite the sins of so many individuals. The land of Jeanne d'Arc and Bernadette and Thérèse of Lisieux may indeed be on its way to prove itself worthy to be called again the eldest daughter of the Church.

That some of the forms in which this revival is making its appearance are startling is indeed unquestionable. That nuns should go to work daily in factories, that priests should offer Mass in kitchens and workshops and chat back and forth with the congregation about the Epistle and Gospel—such things are indeed surprising.

[10] *Ibid.*, p. 194.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 198.

But we must presume that the French hierarchy are aware of such happenings, and consider that they are warranted by the conditions of the times. There is one phase of this movement, however, that demands special attention—the practice adopted by some priests of taking a regular job in order to get closer to the people. One might get the impression from Mrs. Bishop's narrative that this is recognized by the hierarchy as quite the usual thing for the younger French clergy. But a statement made by the Cardinals and Archbishops of France in June, 1946, makes it quite clear that such is not the case. The section pertinent to the question in hand reads thus, in part:

> The desire felt by certain priests and seminarists for closer contact with the masses of working people certainly reveals most excellent intentions. Episcopal authorization could properly be sought by certain members of the clergy desiring to go through a stage of this character for the purpose of acquiring more exact information about the conditions under which the people to whom they minister are working. The assembled bishops think that no objection could be brought against such proposals if made in exceptional circumstances, to be carried out in well-defined conditions, and by clergy possessing the requisite qualities of character and virtue.
>
> But attention must be directed to an error which is liable to enter into such projects, and to the dangerous illusions which they may encourage.
>
> The error consists in not keeping quite distinct the apostolate of the clergy and that of the laity, or in substituting the one for the other. . . . A priest is a man of God, a man of prayer, a man dedicated to the spiritual life, a man appointed to teach and sanctify others by his ministry. What the laity expect in their priests is the witness of a life wholly devoted to the things of God; what they want from him is the spiritual assistance which will animate and guide their own lay apostolate in the world.
>
> It must also be observed that the persons who are most qualified to speak about Catholic Action amongst the workers are unanimous in declaring that the laboring masses do not want their priests to be engaged in manual labor. . . .The experience of manual labor obtained by certain priests in extraordinary circumstances during the war and endured by them with such admirable and supernatural generosity cannot be repeated in the normal conditions of life, nor cited as an example to imitate in the perilous conditions of modern times.[12]

---

[12] Translation from *Clergy Review,* XXVII, 5 (May, 1947), p. 312 ff.

Furthermore, certain statements attributed by Mrs. Bishop to members of the French clergy are difficult to justify, if they were actually made as she narrates. For example, the Superior of the Seminary of the Mission of France is supposed to have said that the clergy of our time must be equipped with "a theology of conquest rather than an established church theology."[13] And a priest is supposed to have told a couple, desirous of being married according to the ecclesiastical form, though they were not fervent or practical Catholics: "Look, you'd better go and get married in the city hall. And later, if you really want to know more about being a Christian and want to be married in the church, you come back here." [14]

One chapter of the book is very misleading. It is the chapter entitled "Ecumenism," the theme being that there is now a strong tendency in France toward Christian unity. It is evident that the author does not recognize certain important distinctions. Thus, she seems to put in the same category an incident which took place in a certain village, where Protestants and Catholics came together to pray and to sing, and the fact that in Paris a Solemn Mass was celebrated in the Byzantine Slavonic [apparently Catholic] rite with Holy Communion under both species. She confuses the Ecumenism approved by the Orthodox Church and the Synod of French Reformed churches with the Church Unity Octave, approved by various Popes. Moreover some of the statements and the quotations given in this chapter are decidedly ambiguous. It is rather difficult to interpret in a Catholic sense the statement attributed to a priest: "They [non-Catholics] are advancing with great strides toward a conception of the church which is identical with ours, even though at the same time they withdraw from us in their ardent determination not to bend under the yoke of Rome." [15] How a concept of the church can be identical with that of Catholics and yet deny the primacy of Peter's successor is difficult to understand. And Mrs. Bishop's implication that an ecumenical movement can be participated in by Catholics who are seeking *unity,* not *union,* is puzzling in the light of Catholic theology.[16] Moreover, we should like to know more about the "Invisible Monastery" "which includes convents, monasteries and groups of Catholics, Anglicans, Orthodox, Protestants and other Christians." [17]

[13] Bishop, *op. cit.,* p. 135.
[14] *Ibid.,* p. 129.
[15] *Ibid.,* p. 212.
[16] *Ibid.,* p. 206.
[17] *Ibid.*

On the whole, the picture presented by Mrs. Bishop is well drawn and is very encouraging. We cannot judge precisely how extensive is the movement she is describing, yet undoubtedly it is strong and active, and bears the characteristics of movements which in past have transformed entire peoples. It is to be hoped that all who read *France Alive,* or a summary of it, such as has been attempted here, will pray that there may now be implanted in the heart of the people of France the germ of a new life of the spirit that will eventually bring the entire nation back to Christ and to His Church.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

TWO ARCHBISHOPS OF BALTIMORE

There were many traits of resemblance in the characters of Archbishop Kenrick and Archbishop Spalding, though the two men were very unlike. Both were gentle and simple, innocent and good in themselves, and unsuspicious of evil in others.

Archbishop Kenrick was reserved. He gave expression to his sentiments in a quiet, subdued way, as though the outer world were not his home; and he seemed at once, without effort, to sink back into the sanctuary of his inner life. Archbishop Spalding, on the contrary, was demonstrative. There was a merry ring in his laugh, suggestive of the undeceived heart of childhood. He had not the art of concealing anything—he thought aloud. He had, too, a plain, blunt way of telling the brutal truth, which sometimes gave offence, and which often astonished those who knew best his perfect gentleness of heart. Both were remarkable for the thoroughness with which their whole nature had been absorbed and remoulded by the spirit of religion. Having come forth from the same school, their theological opinions and views in matters not strictly of faith very generally coincided.

Both of them had found the rare secret of uniting a life of great activity and of manifold external duties with that of the conscientious student, and were thus able, whilst laboring incessantly to build up the church, to become also the guides and directors of Catholic thought, and to enrich the literature of the American church with some of its most important works.

—Bishop John Lancaster Spalding, in *The Life of the Most Rev. M. J. Spalding, D.D.* (New York, no date), pp. 261 f.

THE ORDEAL OF FATHER WALL

PART IV

Fr. Hunseger went to the door in answer to the ringing of the bell. "Why, come in, Father. Glad to see you. Congratulations on your appointment as our Dean. What can I do for you?" exclaimed the younger man as he saw who stood there.

"Well, I got this letter appointing me Dean of this district, and while I guess I know pretty well what a Dean is supposed to do I'm not so sure what this Council of Vigilance business means. So, I came over to ask you, seeing as how you know more Canon Law than any of the rest of us around here."

"I really don't know much about Canon Law, Father. All I know is what I learned in the Seminary and in that course they gave us down at the Chancery Office so that we would know what to do about taking testimony in marriage cases. They had us come in from each deanery, you know, so that when those rogatory commissions come from other dioceses, or when there is testimony to be taken in our own diocesan cases they can appoint somebody as Auditor and have us take down the testimony, reminding the Auditor, if necessary, of what he is supposed to do. It saves a trip for the members of the Court who reside in the city and would have to come quite a way, sometimes, to get the information they need. Besides, we are here and can make arrangements more easily to see the people who are supposed to be questioned."

"Anyway, you do know something about Canon Law. I think you can help me. It will save me a trip to the Chancery Office to find out what it is all about. They might think it funny, too, that at my age I don't know what I'm supposed to do as Dean. So be a sport and help an old man out, will you?"

"Of course, Father. Let's get the books and see what they have to offer. Now, here's *Canon Law,* by Bouscaren and Ellis.[1] They may have something on that Committee of Vigilance for you."

There was nothing in the analytical index on "Vigilance."

"It has to do with women's dress, mostly, doesn't it?" asked Fr. Warmenhuis. "It probably has to do with the behaviour of the clergy,

[1] T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., and Adam C. Ellis, S.J., *Canon Law,* a Text and Commentary (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1946).

too," he added, as Fr. Hunseger continued his search for the words "Women" and "Dress." The search was fruitless, so Fr. Hunseger turned to *The Canon Law Digest*.[2] There in the index to Volume I he found two references to the Council of Vigilance.

The first, under Canon 6, told them that the question had arisen whether the prescriptions on the Council of Vigilance and the oath against Modernism, contained respectively in the Constitution of Pius X, *Pascendi,* of Sept. 8, 1907, and in the *Motu Proprio* of Pius X, *Sacrorum antistitum,* of Sept. 1, 1910, were to remain in effect after the Code, in view of Can. 6,6°, and in view of the fact that they were nowhere mentioned in the Code. To this question the Holy Office had responded on March 22, 1918, with a declaration that the aforesaid prescriptions, enacted on account of the current Modernist errors, were not mentioned in the Code because they were of their nature temporary and transitory; but that, since the virus of Modernism had not ceased to spread, those prescriptions had to remain in full force until the Holy See decreed otherwise. The decree was approved and confirmed by His Holiness, they found.[3]

The second, under Canon 363, told them that the Council of Vigilance was to treat of modesty in women's dress. It pointed out, this Instruction from the Sacred Congregation of the Council,[4] that Pius XI inculcated in word and writing the precept of St. Paul, "Women also in decent apparel; adorning themselves with modesty and sobriety. . . as it becometh women professing godliness, with good works." [5] He had on many occasions reproved and sharply condemned the immodesty in dress everywhere in vogue, even among women and girls who are Catholics, a practice doing grave injury to the crowning virtue and glory of women, and leading unfortunately not only to their temporal disadvantage, but also to their eternal ruin and that of other souls.

The Sacred Congregation, they read, following the orders of His Holiness, laid down certain regulations on the subject. Thus, it instructed pastors and preachers, when they had the opportunity "be instant, reprove, entreat, rebuke," [6] to the end that women may

[2] T. Lincoln Bouscaren, S.J., *The Canon Law Digest* (Milwaukee: Bruce, Vol. I, 1934; Vol. II, 1943).

[3] Cf. *AAS,* X, 136.

[4] Cf. *AAS,* XXII, 26.

[5] Cf. *I Tim.* 2:9, 10.

[6] Cf. *II Tim.* 4:2.

wear clothes of becoming modesty, which may be an ornament and safeguard of virtue; and they must also warn parents not to permit their daughters to wear immodest clothes.

Parents were to see to it, under their obligation to provide for the moral and religious education of their children, that their girls received solid instruction in Christian doctrine from their earliest years. They were likewise to train them by word and example to a love of modesty and chastity. They were also to prevent their daughters from taking part in public drills and athletic contests. If the girls were obliged to take part in them the parents were to see to it that they wore a costume which was entirely modest, and never permit them to appear in immodest dress.

Heads of girls' schools and colleges, said the Congregation, were to imbue the hearts of their girls with the love of modesty so that they would be induced to dress modestly. They were not to admit to their schools or colleges girls who were given to immodest dress, and if they were admitted already, they were to dismiss them.

Nuns were not to admit to their colleges, schools, oratories, or amusement centers, nor allow to remain there any girls who did not observe Christian modesty in dress, and in educating their charges they were to take special care to sow deeply in their hearts a love of chastity and Christian modesty.

Pious associations of women were to be established and fostered for the purpose of restraining by counsel, example, and activity, abuses regarding immodest dress, and of promoting purity of morals and modesty of dress.

Women who wore immodest clothes, they read further, were not to be admitted to those associations, and those who had been admitted, if they afterward committed any fault in this regard and failed to amend after being warned, were to be expelled.

Girls and women who were immodestly dressed were to be refused Holy Communion and excluded from the office of sponsor in the sacraments of baptism and confirmation; and in proper cases were even to be excluded from the church.

On such feasts of the year as offered special opportunities for inculcating Christian modesty, especially on the feasts of the Blessed Virgin, pastors and priests who had charge of pious unions and Catholic associations were not to fail to preach a timely sermon on the subject in order to encourage women to cultivate Christian

modesty in dress. On the feast of the Immaculate Conception, special prayers were to be recited every year in all cathedral and parish churches, and when it was possible there was also to be a timely exhortation by way of a solemn sermon to the people.

The diocesan Council of Vigilance, mentioned in the declaration of the Holy Office, March 22, 1918, was, at least once a year, to treat especially of the ways and means of providing effectively for modesty in women's dress.

The Bishops and other Ordinaries of places were every third year, together with their report on religious instruction mentioned in the *Motu Proprio, Orbem Catholicum,* June 29, 1923,[7] to inform the Sacred Congregation upon the situation as regards women's dress, and upon the measures taken in pursuance of the Instruction.

Fr. Warmenhuis nodded in satisfaction. He had been telling the women and girls in his parish for years about the short skirts they were wearing and the goo they slapped on their faces, and the bloody look of their nails. So he had been right in line with the Congregation all along. That was fine. Now, as Dean, he would see to it that the other pastors did not go soft on this matter.

The second volume of *The Canon Law Digest* revealed nothing on the Council of Vigilance in its index.

"It didn't say anything about watching priests, did it?" asked Fr. Warmenhuis, as if he were somewhat surprised.

"No. That must be left up to the Bishop," rejoined Fr. Hunseger.

"Now what about that Modernism business? Is there any such thing around any more? I remember hearing something about it at the time I was ordained, but haven't heard a word of it since. Do you think that I have to do anything about that?"

"Well, you're on the Council of Vigilance and there is no indication that it has been abolished, so I suppose you will have to read up on the subject. I don't imagine you will have any occasion to use it around here. We don't have any of those deep thinkers who get into that sort of trouble; but you might as well find out what it is all about."

"Have you got any books on the subject?"

[7] Cf. *AAS,* XV, 327.

"There's always Denzinger, you know," answered Fr. Hunseger, taking down the 1928 edition from his shelf.[8]

They found that Pius X complained that the number of the enemies of the Cross of Christ had grown greatly in these latter days. There were those among the Catholic laity and even among the clergy who, without a solid protection from philosophy and theology, even imbued with completely poisoned doctrines taught by those who hate the Church, pretended to be reformers of the Church itself, and attacked even the person of the Divine Redeemer. They did not arrange their ideas, he said, in a definite order, but let them appear scattered and separate, so that they appeared doubtful and vague, though they were really firm and consistent. The Pope, therefore, in his Encyclical proceeded to analyze and refute their errors.[9]

He took their philosophical errors based on agnosticism, considering human reason to be entirely limited by phaenomena—Fr. Warmenhuis squirmed in his chair—which destroyed natural theology, the motives of credibility, and external revelation. To this he opposed the definitions of the Vatican Council.[10]

They passed from this, the Pope pointed out, to a scientific and historical atheism excluding God and anything divine.[11] They embraced the principle of religious immanentism, something coming out of the feelings of the heart, so that faith would be placed in some inner feeling arising from a need of the divine, a sub-conscious thing. This need for the divine in a mind inclined to religion, without any intellectual judgment, stirred up a particular feeling which had the divine "reality" implied in itself and somehow joined man with God.[12]

By this time Fr. Warmenhuis' head was swimming, but they plunged on to see how they got revelation mixed up with this inner religious feeling, so that "religious conscience" was laid down as a universal rule.[13]

The historical criticism of these people resulted in a consideration of Christ as a mere man, whose historical person was transfigured by "faith," so that it would be necessary to withdraw from it any-

[8] H. Denzinger—C. Bannwart—J. B. Umberg, S.J., *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, (Friburgi Br.: Herder and Co).

[9] *Ibid.*, n. 2071.

[10] *Ibid.*, n. 2072.

[11] *Ibid.*, n. 2073.

[12] *Ibid.*, n. 2074

[13] *Ibid.*, n. 2075.

thing which seemed to lift it above historical conditions. Finally, the person of Christ was supposed to have been deformed by faith, wherefore it would be necessary to remove from it words, actions, whatever, in other words, did not correspond to his character, state in life, education, place and time.[14]

"Thanks a lot, Father, for your help. I appreciate very much the information you have given me," said Fr. Warmenhuis, rising and reaching for his hat.

"Oh, but there's a lot more here about Modernism."

"Some other time. I just remembered I have to get back for a meeting in the parish hall, and I may be late if I don't hurry. I'll see you again and find out some more about all this."

Driving home, Fr. Warmenhuis shook his head. He was not so certain that it was going to be a nice thing to be a Dean, if you had to study up on all that stuff.

* * * * *

In his office the Bishop sat collecting the various points which he intended to investigate regarding Fr. Wall. When he had finished, the list showed:

(1) What is his zeal in looking after his own parishioners? [15]

(2) Is he prudent (consider firing of janitor)? [16]

(3) Has he been absent from the parish more than sixty (60) days a year? [17]

(4) Did he fail culpably to bring the sacraments to the woman who was dying? [18]

(5) Has he corrected properly the faults of his parishioners? [19]

(6) Has he provided sufficient catechetical instruction for children who live at a distance and cannot attend his school? [20]

(7) Has he investigated properly in cases of marriage involving people from his own parish? [21]

(8) Has he taken care to procure recent legal certificates of Baptism with notations as to freedom to marry? [22]

(9) Has he investigated sufficiently the parish or parishes in which the marriage will have to be recorded? [23]

[14] *Ibid.*, n. 2076.

[15] Cf. Can. 453, §2.

[16] Cf. Can. 453, §2.

[17] Cf. Can. 465, §2.

[18] Cf. Can. 468, §1.

[19] Cf. Can. 467, §1.

[20] Cf. Can. 467, §1.

[21] Cf. Instr., *AAS*, XXXIII, 297 (1941), §4, a.

[22] Cf. *ibid.*, §4, c, d.

[23] *Ibid.*, §4, c, β

(10) Has he investigated sufficiently in cases of asserted death of a previous spouse or of nullity of a previous marriage? [24]

(11) Has he investigated all cases in which the Catholic form of marriage is supposed to be used? [25]

(12) Has his manner of conducting the investigation been proper? [26]

(13) Has he investigated properly the question of consanguinity? [27]

(14) Has he been careful to give the proper reasons for the dispensations which he has requested for parties from his parish? [28]

(15) Has he been careful to obtain full and complete replies to the question whether the parties are entering the marriage freely? [29]

(16) Has he made a proper investigation of the knowledge of the parties as to Christian doctrine? [30]

(17) Has he been careful to discover whether the parties are putting conditions on their marital consent; and if so, what has he done when he has discovered such conditions? [31]

(18) Has he recorded the marriages properly in the register of baptism? [32]

(19) Has he been careful to watch over conditions affecting faith and morals in the schools in his territory? [33]

(20) Has he encouraged works of charity, faith, and piety in his parish? [34]

(21) Has he made the Catechism interesting? [35]

(22) Has he been using the outlines sent out from the Diocesan Catechetical Office? [36]

(23) Has he been keeping up with all directives from that Office?

(24) Is the language in his sermons adapted to the comprehension of his hearers? [37]

(25) Is his use of profane authors in sermons excessive? [38]

Calling in his secretary, the Bishop instructed him to send a letter to Fr. Warmenhuis, the Dean, or Vicar Foraine, to have him find out what ideas the people in the Jordan parish had been getting

[24] *Ibid.*, §4, c, ε §6.
[25] *Ibid.*, §4, c, δ.
[26] *Ibid.*, §4, d.
[27] *Ibid.*, §5, a, α-γ.
[28] *Ibid.*, §5, a, δ.
[29] *Ibid.*, §7.
[30] *Ibid.*, §8.
[31] *Ibid.*, §9.
[32] *Ibid.*, §11, e-f.
[33] Cf. Can. 469.
[34] Cf. Can. 469.
[35] Decree, *AAS*, XXVII, 145 (1935), §II, c.
[36] *Ibid.*, §III, 1, c.
[37] Norms, *AAS*, IX, 328 (1917), §27.
[38] *Ibid.*, §23.

out of Fr. Wall's sermons on marriage. What sort of an idea did they have of the various impediments, both diriment and impedient?[39]

The Dean was also to investigate the teachers in the Jordan parish who taught Catechism. Were they suitable?[40] Did they know what they were teaching and how to teach it? Furthermore, how well did they use the special series of lessons on the Catechism which were sent out regularly from the Diocesan Catechetical Office?

The principal causes for which even an "irremovable" pastor could be removed from his parish[41] were: (1) lack of experience or permanent illness of mind or body, which made the pastor incapable of performing properly his duties, unless in the judgment of the Ordinary the good of souls could be sufficiently provided for through a vicar *adjutor* according to Can. 475; (2) *Odium plebis,* even though unjustified and not universal, provided it was such as to impede the ministry of the pastor, rendering it useless, and was not foreseen soon to cease; (3) loss of good reputation among upright and serious men, whether this proceeded from the lack of seriousness in the way of life of the pastor himself, or from an old crime which had recently been detected but could not be prosecuted because the statute of limitations had run, or from something done by members of his household and his relatives with whom the pastor lived, unless through their departure the good reputation of the pastor could be sufficiently provided for; (4) a probable occult crime imputed to the pastor, from which the Ordinary prudently foresaw that in the future great offense to the faithful might arise; (5) bad administration of temporal affairs with grave damage to the church or the benefice, whenever a remedy therefor could not be found either in taking the administration away from the pastor, or in some other way, although the pastor otherwise usefully exercised the spiritual ministry.

As to the first of these reasons for removal, the Bishop did not think that there was any lack of experience evident in Fr. Wall's conduct of the affairs of the parish. There was certainly no indication of illness either of mind or of body. The old man was in good health and able to get around and take care of his work quite effi-

[39] Instr., *AAS,* XXXIII, 297 (1941), §5, a, ζ.

[40] Decree, *AAS,* XXVII, 145 (1935), §III, 4.

[41] Cf. Can. 2147, §2.

ciently. No, there was no need to think about a vicar *adjutor* for the Jordan parish.

The second reason for removal was the one which seemed to call for the most consideration. The stories going around the parish, which were getting back to the Bishop, showed that quite a number of the people were unsympathetic to Fr. Wall, to put it mildly. The thing seemed to have started with the firing of Faber, but even after he had been rehired at a higher salary the stories were continuing. That was not good. The dislike for Wall did not seem to be universal, but it might be beginning to interfere with his priestly ministry. If that were the case it would be necessary to remove Wall. That was a point which he would have to take up with the Synodal examiners, after he had more information to submit to them for consideration.[42]

There did not seem to be anything in the stories which reflected on Fr. Wall's reputation, either from his own mode of life or from that of his household. There was only the housekeeper living at the rectory, and there was no indication of reproach there. His relatives did not live in Jordan, the Bishop knew. They sometimes, but quite rarely, came to visit him. Mostly he seemed to go to visit them at their home. There was nothing said about them in the parish, so far as he could determine from the information he had. Bad news travels faster than good, so lack of news was probably an indication that there was nothing bad in the situation.

There had been no charge of some occult crime made against Fr. Wall, who had apparently been too busy with his parish work in the past to get into a situation which would found such an accusation. Prudent he must have been all through his life never to leave an opening for something which might arise later to make people suspect with probability some serious fault which would cause him the loss of his parish. It was a relief not to have to contend with something like that in the present case, which would proceed, it seemed, strictly on Fr. Wall's performance as pastor.

Fr. Wall's administration, finally, of temporal goods seemed not to have caused any serious damage, either to the church or to the benefice. In fact, if anything, he seemed to have administered things pretty well, since he had succeeded in building the school and in rebuilding and enlarging the church during his time in Jordan. He

[42] Cf. Can. 2148, §1.

had built a home for the Sisters who taught in the school, too. He had not as yet got around to doing much on his own house, preferring, as he had told the Bishop, to let that go until he had taken proper care of the needs of the people as to the church and school, and of the Sisters who gave so much to the parish by teaching the children. He had paid off all the debts incurred in the physical expansion of the parish even though the depression had made it hard at times for him to keep up on the payments on his notes.

Now that times were better and there had been an influx of new parishioners, come to work in the plant which had been put up in Jordan during the war, the Bishop supposed that the old man must feel himself on Easy Street. Poor chap, he had been used to pinching pennies for so long, he had probably not realized that it might be necessary to loosen the purse-strings to pay a higher wage to the janitor. It had taken an order from the diocesan court to convince him of that; but once he had received the order, and had lost his appeal of the case, he had gone along and the janitor had been properly paid. Now, of course, Faber was paid even more, since the pastor had had to bid higher to get him back.

Wondering just how much better off Fr. Wall was now, financially, with the increased number of parishioners and the easier flow of money, the Bishop called the Chancellor on the inter-office phone and asked him to bring in the financial report of the Jordan parish.

* * * * *

Fr. Wall put down the telephone and smiled a bit grimly to himself. So, the people in his parish were beginning to say that he could not preach a good sermon, were they? Well, he'd show them. Here was a golden opportunity, too, this invitation to give the sermon at the closing of Forty Hours over in Wheeler. He'd make it the best sermon ever heard around these parts. By the time he got through the people in Wheeler would be telling his people in Jordan what a wonderful preacher they had, or his name wasn't John Wall.

Of course, to do that he would have to get hold of something out of the ordinary. He couldn't rely on the usual sermon books. He'd have to dig up something else and work it into a sermon. It had been a long time since he had written out a sermon, the way he used to do when he was a young priest just out on the mission, but an occasion like this called for it, and that was just what he

would do. He started looking over the books on his shelves. He'd find something deep, something that would impress the people, yes, and the priests who would be there, too. He'd show them, most of them were youngsters anyway, that the old fellows had fire in them yet, and could beat these young fellows any day, when it came to getting up and giving a good sermon.

Now, what would be a good book to start from? Title after title he passed over, saying to himself that he had seen it in the library of some one of the priests of the district. He wouldn't use one that they were familiar with, for then the impression would be lost. He'd have to find one they didn't know about. Finally, his gaze rested on one which he had had ever since he had left the seminary. He had never seen it in any other rectory that he had visited. This was it, and from the title it should have some good stuff for a Forty Hours sermon. *Le Quatrième Évangile,* that was it, the Fourth Gospel, where St. John tells about the Last Supper. Of course, his French was somewhat rusty these days, but with the aid of a dictionary he should be able to get some ideas. Now, if those ideas were just deep enough, he had what he was after. Thumbing hurriedly through the book, he decided that it was deep, all right, and laid it on his desk so that he would have it close to hand when he sat down to prepare the sermon.

It had been a long time since he had tried to preach a sermon on the Scriptures. Maybe he should give his people some of that stuff. It might do them good, and it would certainly be different from what he had been giving them in the past. Maybe a change was what they were waiting for. If that was it, then that was what they would get. He'd see what kind of an impression the sermon made on the people over in Wheeler. If they were interested he'd try it at home, too. Give them some good, solid, meaty stuff, that was the idea.

With a fire and enthusiasm which he had not know in years when it came to preparing a sermon, Fr. Wall seated himself at his desk and started writing furiously as he noted sections of the book which he intended to take up.

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE THEOLOGICAL PROOF FOR THE NECESSITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

Part III

The theological proof for the necessity of the Catholic Church is a strict demonstration of the fact that what the Church actually teaches on this subject in its official documents is manifestly contained in the sources of divine revelation. In its Pontifical and conciliar pronouncements, the *ecclesia docens* teaches as a part of God's own message the truth that the Church is necessary for salvation, in the very real sense that outside of it no one at all can be saved. Furthermore, from these same ecclesiastical pronouncements, we learn that a person may be said to be "outside" the Church when he has neither membership in this visible society nor any intention of entering it. Finally, the doctrinal utterances of the *ecclesia docens* inform us that even an implicit desire to enter the Church may be effective unto salvation in a person who is invincibly ignorant of the one true fold of Jesus Christ, although they also point to the highly important fact that the spiritual position of any person who is not a member of the Catholic Church is disadvantageous to himself and objectively contrary to God's will.

This complex truth, set in its proper background of the Catholic dogma about the Church of Christ, and seen as one of the basic theses in the Catholic theology of the missions, stands out in the deposit of divine public revelation. The theological proof is the process whereby we indicate the way in which this thesis is contained in Scripture and in divine apostolic tradition, the two sources of divine public revelation. Furthermore, precisely because it manifests the thesis or conclusion in its place in the deposit of faith, the theological proof offers an invaluable understanding of this truth. When the Vatican Council taught that reason, enlightened by faith, could gain a most fruitful understanding of the divinely revealed mysteries by way of analogy of these mysteries with the natural objects of human intelligence and through the connection of the mysteries among themselves and with the last end of man, it was referring to the theological demonstration.[1]

[1] Session III, chapter 4. Cf Denzinger, *Enchiridion symbolorum* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1937), n. 1796.

What the Vatican Council had to say on this subject is perfectly exemplified in the theological proof of the thesis on the Church's necessity for salvation. The analogy between the mystery and the natural objects of human intelligence has been used to produce the various technical terms that enter into the thesis and its explanation. The words appearing in a modern presentation of this thesis by authors like Zapelena and Parente did not occur in the scriptural or in the earliest patristic enunciation of the same doctrine. Terms like "the necessity of means" and "visible society," to mention only two of them, were introduced into this section of theology because the theologians as a group, and ultimately the *ecclesia docens* itself, found that the meanings these expressions conveyed in the world of nature could be of service in the formation of an absolutely correct and unequivocal statement about the mystery of God's kingdom on earth.

The process of analogy with things of the natural order serves the science of sacred theology chiefly in the development of an acceptable terminology. The theological demonstration as such, however, is effected primarily through the observation of the connection and interrelation of the revealed mysteries among themselves. Such is manifestly the case in the proof of the Church's necessity for eternal salvation, as that proof is elaborated by the foremost theologians of our age. In their writings they cite the connection of the Church with Our Lord, with the true and necessary worship of God, and with the sacrament of baptism as factors in the theological evidence that the teaching on the Church's real necessity for salvation is contained in the deposit of faith delivered to the Church by the apostles as the divine message of Christ.

Taken as a group, modern theologians have presented a valid and effective proof of the Church's necessity. They have used these arguments from the necessity of union with Our Lord, of the true religion, and of Christian baptism, along with many other factors, to produce a demonstration of the fact that men really need the visible Catholic Church in order to attain the life of heaven. Unfortunately, however, they have not taken what would appear to be anything like sufficient cognizance of one "connection" which, of itself, is capable of giving that proof an apodeictic perfection and an enlightening power far beyond what that proof contains in its present state of development. They have not integrated the basic scrip-

tural theology of salvation itself into their demonstration, and thereby they have overlooked what can and should be a decisively effective factor in this proof. Scripture itself shows salvation as essentially involving a social concept. It is the divine gift by which a man is transferred, by the beneficent power of God, from one social entity to another.

The primary purpose of this series of articles is to show how the proof of the Church's necessity for salvation attains a genuinely new perfection when it includes an analysis of the New Testament teaching about that salvation which comes to men through the sacrificial death of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The greatest benefit which this hitherto somewhat neglected element in the theological proof of the Church's necessity brings to sacred doctrine is a manifestation of the fact that the Catholic Church is something essential to and inhering in the process of salvation itself. As it stands in too many of the modern manuals of sacred theology, the proof of the Church's necessity is constructed in such a way as to leave room for the suspicion that the visible society of Our Lord's disciples is not essentially and connaturally a factor in the process of salvation at all, but that it enters this process solely by reason of a positive divine ordinance. The man who is deceived into adopting this view as an opinion has lost sight of one of the most important truths in all the deposit of sacred teaching. Actually the Catholic Church, by reason of its nature as God's kingdom on earth, enters into the very concept of salvation, in such a way that the salvation described in the divine public revelation cannot be understood at all adequately except in terms of this visible society.

In order to understand how an exposition of the New Testament theology of salvation can perfect the demonstration of the Church's necessity, we must know something about the status of this proof in modern writings. In their treatment of this particular proof, the more recent theologians exhibit an amazing diversity of presentation. Indeed, those individuals who habitually deplore what they believe to be drab uniformity of modern theological writing would be hard pressed to explain or justify their attitude if they took the trouble to examine even a few twentieth-century presentations of this proof.

Much of this diversity can be attributed to the fact that some of the authors have tried to show that the Church itself is only neces-

sary as the ordinary means of salvation or by reason of a divine precept. Others have confused the issue by intruding into their proofs certain elements which go to show that appurtenance to or membership in the "soul of the Church" must be considered as requisite for salvation. Such tentatives have had the inevitable effect of beclouding the issue, and of obscuring the meaning of the documents which they must adduce. The ecclesiastical documents are such as to support only the basic contention, that the visible Catholic Church, the kingdom of God on earth, is actually necessary for all men.

Despite this diversity of treatment, however, the modern theologians as a group have worked very effectively to demonstrate their thesis. Most of them tend to list separately the pertinent documents of the *ecclesia docens,* the texts from Holy Scripture, passages from the Fathers, and a certain number of *rationes theologicae.* Billot and Herrmann[2] have been especially successful in utilizing the biblical texts in the elaboration of a genuine theological proof. They have thus integrated their demonstration much more effectively than have some of their confreres.

Most of the texts employed in the "proof from Scripture" by modern theologians deal directly with the necessity of union with Our Lord or with the Church itself. The strictly ecclesiological texts are again divided into two classes, those which deal with the commission and the power of the Church, and those which treat of the evil of voluntary separation from it.

The texts that refer to the necessity of union with Our Lord for the attainment of salvation are employed as the prerequisite for a demonstration of the fact that the Catholic Church, as the Mystical Body of Christ, is itself necessary. Three texts are used quite frequently for this purpose. The first is the passage in St. John's Gospel containing Our Lord's statement: "I am the door. By me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved. . . ." [3] The second, also from the fourth Gospel, records Our Lord's words to St. Thomas the Apostle: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life. No man cometh

[2] Cf. Billot, *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi* (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), I, 117 ff; Herrmann, *Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris: Vitte, 1937), I, 373 ff.

[3] *John,* 10: 9.

to the Father but by me." [4] The third is a doctrine taught by St. Peter in his discourse to the Sanhedrin after he and St. John had been taken into custody because of the miraculous cure of the lame man in the temple. It is the statement that "Neither is there salvation in any other. For there is no other name under heaven given to men, whereby we must be saved." [5]

The principal texts pertinent to the divine commission of the Church are found in the final chapters of the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Mark. The first of these contains the words Our Lord spoke to the eleven disciples just before His ascension.

. . .All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.

Going therefore, teach ye all nations: baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. And behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world. [6]

The citation from the second Gospel is even more directly and perfectly demonstrative.

And he said to them: Go ye into the whole world and preach the gospel to every creature.

He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved: but he that believeth not shall be condemned.[7]

The theologians also point to the texts in which the evangelists speak of the instructions Our Lord gave to the twelve apostles and to the seventy-two disciples when they were being sent to preach the kingdom of God in His name. The first of these passages is found in St. Matthew's Gospel.

And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words: going forth out of that house or city shake off the dust from your feet.

Amen I say to you, it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrha in the day of judgment than for that city.[8]

The first Gospel also records that Our Lord's discourse included the statement: "He that receiveth you receiveth me: and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." [9] St. Luke's account of the sending of the seventy-two contains a negative version of this

[4] *John*, 14: 6.
[5] *Acts*, 4: 12.
[6] *Matt.* 28: 18-20.
[7] *Mark*, 16: 15-16.
[8] *Matt.* 10: 14-15.
[9] *Matt.* 10: 40.

same doctrine. "He that heareth you, heareth me: and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. And he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me." [10] Both of these texts are widely used in the proof from scripture for the thesis that the Catholic Church is necessary for eternal salvation.

Taken simply by themselves, these last two texts serve primarily and directly to prove only that the Church is necessary with the necessity of precept. They show that a man or a community sins against God in rejecting the message which Our Lord preached and which the apostles and their fellow-workers proposed in His name. The passage from the last chapter in St. Mark's Gospel has a far greater probative force even when taken individually. It indicates that men can achieve salvation through the doctrinal mission of the Church as well as that they will be condemned if they reject its teachings. The parallel text from St. Matthew implicitly teaches the necessity of the Church when it states His promise to be with the Church while it fulfils the mission He has entrusted to it.

Another group of texts employed in the scholastic presentation of our proof deals directly with the evil of leaving the Church. Several of the theologians quote from St. Matthew's Gospel the warning "And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." [11] Others point to the words of St. Paul's epistle to Titus:

> A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, avoid: Knowing that he that is such an one is subverted and sinneth, being condemned by his own judgment.[12]

The theologians also point to another text which deals with this same truth, and which has a more effective probative value for their thesis than the others. It is found in the Second Epistle of St. John.

> Whosoever revolteth and continueth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God. He that continueth in the doctrine, the same hath both the Father and the Son.
>
> If any man come to you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into the house not say to him: God speed you.
>
> For he that saith unto him: God speed you, communicateth with his wicked works.[13]

---

[10] *Luke*, 10: 16.

[11] *Matt.* 18: 17.

[12] *Titus*, 3: 10-11.

[13] *II John*, 9-11.

The immediate implication of these texts is the lesson that it is an evil thing to abandon the Church and the faith of Jesus Christ. The last citation also brings out the truth that the continuation in the doctrine as one of the faithful, as a member of the society of the disciples, carries with it fellowship with God. It does not, by itself, prove that there is no other way to gain this fellowship with God, and hence, taken individually, this final series of texts does not constitute an apodeictic proof of the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation.

Far more important than the proof from scripture alone is the *ratio theologica* properly so-called, which most of the writers unfortunately separate from the scriptural and patristic evidence in favor of their thesis. In by far the greater number of modern theological works, the *ratio theologica* is composed of several elements, in such a way that the thesis is established, not by any one integrated proof, but by a series of arguments. In almost every case the cumulative effect of these various demonstrations is amply sufficient, although various individual elements of the argument in a few theological works are not completely satisfactory.

In modern manuals one of the most popular individual arguments in the strictly theological proof of the Church's necessity for salvation is the one based upon the necessity of baptism. The numerous modern authors who employ this argument reason that the Church is manifestly necessary for salvation because it is so intimately connected with baptism, which is itself requisite for the attainment of eternal blessedness. The sacrament which God has instituted as the means for obtaining the beginning of the life of grace and the remission of original sin is the rite of initiation into the society of Our Lord's disciples.

Another tremendously popular theological argument for the Church's necessity is that based upon the necessity of that faith which the Church alone preaches infallibly and authoritatively. It follows that because acceptance of the divine message preached by Our Lord is incumbent upon men if they are to obtain salvation, that men stand in obvious need of the society which divine revelation indicates as the one divinely commissioned and inerrant guardian and teacher of that revelation. Akin to the demonstrations based upon the necessity of baptism and that of faith are those demonstrations which manifest the Church's necessity in terms of man's need

for the means of salvation and for the ecclesiastical ministry, to be found properly only within the Catholic society. Several of the theologians make special mention of the power of the keys, which obviously belongs to the true Church alone.

Each one of these demonstrations taken individually is valid as a proof that the Catholic Church is really necessary for salvation with the necessity of means. Taken together, their force is unquestioned. Unfortunately, however, proofs of this sort have a tendency to make the Church look like something which is in itself an extrinsic factor in the economy of salvation, and as necessary for eternal life only by reason of a positive enactment by God. To a lesser extent this shortcoming is shared by the proof from the necessity for a true religion, or an authorized worship of God, which is to be found only in the Church of His Son.

Another class of proofs centers around the concept of the Church as the institution so intimately united with Our Lord that it is called His Mystical Body. The theologians reason correctly that, because union with Our Lord is necessary for the attainment of those blessings which come to us only through Him, the Church itself must be considered as manifestly necessary in terms of its identity as the fellowship of Christ. The Church is not merely a society within which a man can find association with the Saviour. Objectively it is the company of Christ, the supernatural family or household of God within which He dwells. Hence the proof based upon this characteristic manifests the Church, not as a merely acceptable society, but as a fellowship within which a man must live in order to achieve the Beatific Vision.

Most of the modern theologians who employ this argument make no effort to restrict themselves to any one of the many designations of the Church. They speak of this society, not only as the Mystical Body of Christ, but also as the kingdom of God on earth, as the New Israel, and particularly as the Church of the promises. They realize that the efficacy of their proof depends entirely upon their success in bringing out the truth that the deposit of divine revelation represents the Catholic Church precisely as the recipient of the various and ineffably glorious promises which Our Lord made to the company of His followers. They point to the fact that when Our Lord said "I am with you all days," He was promising to be present in the visible Catholic Church, and that when He declared that the

gates of hell would not prevail against His Church, He was speaking of a prerogative of this same visible society.

Several modern theologians integrate into their proof the doctrine that man stands in real need of the ecclesiastical ministry. This ministry exists only in the Catholic Church. In short, they teach that the visible Catholic Church and its divinely instituted resources are requisite for union with Our Lord, apart from whom there is no possibility of eternal salvation.

In this tremendously complicated process of proof, modern theology presents irrefutable evidence that the salvation which Our Lord merited for men by His sacrificial death is not to be obtained outside of His Church. Nevertheless, the effectiveness and the clarity of this demonstration would be greatly improved by an integration into it of the basic theology of salvation itself. The fundamental truths which God has revealed to us about the process of salvation stand out clearly in the New Testament, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul. This particular section of sacred teaching is considered in the theological treatise on grace, and particularly in the treatise on the effects of Our Lord's passion and death. The *Summa theologica* contains a magnificent exposition of this truth in the 49th question of its third part.

Salvation itself is something which God has procured for man through the passion of Christ. As its very name implies, salvation involves a transfer from one status to another, from an unfavorable and even fatal condition to a position of security and perfection. In the supernatural order, salvation consists in the process of bringing a man from a condition of aversion from God through sin into the status of one who lives the life of grace.

Now the inspired word of God clearly teaches, and the science of sacred theology rightly explains, that this process of supernatural salvation is intrinsically a social as well as an individual reality. A man is said to be saved by the meritorious power of Jesus Christ when he has been freed from the bonds of sin and constituted as an adopted child of God and as a brother of Our Lord through the life of sanctifying grace. This passage from the state of sin to the state of grace is what we may call the individual aspect of salvation. There is, however, a social or corporate aspect of this same divine gift, just as essentially pertinent to it as its individual connotation. The corporate aspect of salvation is to be found in the

transfer of a person from the kingdom of Satan into that social entity which we know as the kingdom of God or the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ.

The dominion of God's chief spiritual enemy over unregenerate and sinful mankind is clearly asserted in sacred doctrine. Satan's rule over the multitude subject to him is, of course, in no way completely parallel to Our Lord's sway over the company of His associates. Nevertheless he actually exercises a certain kind of dominance, and is so placed that Our Lord Himself could speak of His principal foe as "the prince of this world." [14] In his *Summa theologica,* St. Thomas Aquinas teaches that Satan actually may be said to govern those in the state of aversion from God and that thus he may be termed the head of these individuals.[15] It follows, then, that the people subject to Satan in this way constitute a sort of loosely organized community, united by the one evil will of their chief.

This community is the thing which the early theologians called the *ecclesia malignantium.*[16] Its work is directed by Satan against God and against God's supernatural kingdom in this world. Primarily the process of salvation involves a transfer from this *ecclesia malignantium* into the kingdom of God on earth, the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, the true *ecclesia sanctorum.*

These two companies are intermingled on earth. Every man on earth belongs to one or to the other of these social units. An individual who is held by the bonds of original sin, together with mortal sin or even apart from it, is definitely under the power and the direction of Satan, and thus forms part of his kingdom. The great mystery of God's economy with His followers is the fact that God's kingdom on earth in this, its final status before the end of the world, is a visible and fully organized society. The work of Satan's realm is directed against this visible community, the Catholic Church of Jesus Christ.

[14] *John,* 12:31; 14:30; 16:11.

[15] Cf. *Summa theologica,* IIIa, qu. 8, art. 7.

[16] The expression is taken from Psalm 25:5. The new translation has *"conventum male agentium."* For a discussion of the use of this expression in the early post-Reformation Catholic writings, see the article "Scholastic Definitions of the Catholic Church," Part I, in *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* CXI, 1 (July, 1944), 59 ff.

Because God's kingdom on earth is a visible society, it is possible to be one of its members and at the same time to be subject to Satan through the aversion from God inherent in the status of mortal sin. Thus the Catholic who lives in the state of sin constitutes himself as a traitor to Our Lord. He lives, by God's mercy, as a citizen within the City of God, and at the same time, by reason of his own malignity, he places himself under the control of the enemy of God.

In any event, the salvation of an individual involves a passage from the dominion of Satan into the kingdom of God. In the case of a person who has not been baptized, this means a transfer from a community ruled over by the spiritual enemy of God to the community or family which is truly and supernaturally God's kingdom. In the case of a Catholic who has fallen into sin, it means the abandonment of the ties which have bound this hitherto unworthy and disloyal member of Christ to the enemy of Christ, and the completion within this person of the bonds of unity which attach him to his Saviour within the company of the disciples. In other words, it means that he acquires charity and grace, which belong to the internal bond of unity. In this latter case the process of salvation is essentially a return to loyalty within the kingdom of God.

St. Paul's Epistles show us very clearly this intrinsically social connotation of salvation. Thus the letter to the Colossians entreats the Christians to remain

> Giving thanks to God the Father, who hath made us worthy to be partakers of the lot of the saints in light:
> Who hath delivered us from the power of darkness and hath translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love.[17]

To be under the power of darkness was not to be a neutral with reference to God and His supernatural kingdom. According to St. Paul, the condition of these people was that of enemies.

> And you, whereas you were sometime alienated and enemies in mind in evil works:
> Yet now he hath reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unspotted and blameless before him.[18]

The Epistle to the Galatians insists upon the social or corporate character of salvation. It speaks of Our Lord Jesus Christ "Who

[17] *Col.*, 1: 12-13. [18] *Col.*, 1: 21-22.

gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from this present wicked world, according to the will of God and our Father." [19] The same lesson is brought out in the Epistle to the Hebrews.

> Therefore because the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself in like manner hath been partaker of the same: that, through death, he might destroy him who had the empire of death, that is to say, the devil:
> And might deliver them who through the fear of death were all their lifetime subject of servitude.[20]

St. Peter's words at the conclusion of his missionary sermon on the first Christian Pentecost stress the corporate or social aspect of salvation.

> And with many other words did he testify and exhort them, saying: Save yourselves from this perverse generation.
> They therefore that received his word were baptized: and there were added in that day about three thousand souls.[21]

He brought out the fact that the salvation with which Christian teaching is concerned involves a removal from the perverse or crooked generation, from a social unit turned away from God. The attainment of this salvation, however, was understood to involve affiliation with the company of Christ, the visible religious organization over which Peter himself presided. The people who accepted the Christian teaching of Peter acted to save themselves from the society of Satan by incorporating themselves into the company of Christ.

Throughout this inspired teaching we find the salvation which God has decreed to give to men represented as a passage from one empire to another, from the company of Satan to the kingdom of Christ. We could not understand the process of salvation at all if we were to forget the fact that sin or aversion from God necessarily carries with it a real subjection to the devil, and that grace or the sharing of the divine life necessarily involves affiliation with the company of Jesus Christ. A man is either a friend or an enemy of his God. He is either possessed of the life of grace or turned away from his ultimate and supernatural end. And he can be neither a saint nor a sinner alone. He stands either with the Church militant, the army of the living God, or with the cohorts of Satan.

[19] *Gal.* 1:4. [20] *Heb.* 2: 14-15. [21] *Acts* 2: 40-41.

Thus the kingdom of God on earth is presented in divine revelation as something inherently and necessarily requisite for the process of salvation. Just as opposition to God in original or mortal sin necessarily and intrinsically involves participation in the kingdom of Satan, conversion to God in the life of grace involves an entrance into the company of Christ, the *ecclesia sanctorum*. The concept of a man who would live the life of grace or salvation outside of Christ's kingdom is, according to God's own revealed teaching, something like the idea of a square circle, a mere combination of utterly incompatible elements.

Thus we see that the ultimate and all-important link in the chain of proof that the visible Catholic Church is necessary for salvation with the necessity of means is the basic Christian truth that this visible Catholic Church is absolutely identified with the kingdom of God, the Mystical Body of Christ, on this earth. It is precisely because and only because the visible religious society over which the Roman Pontiff presides as Christ's Vicar is God's kingdom and city and household in this world that this visible organization is proposed to us in the divinely revealed message as really necessary for the life of grace on earth and for the final flowering of that life in heaven. As the kingdom of God on earth, the Catholic Church is the company into which a man is brought by the process of salvation itself.

And, because it is the kingdom of God on earth, the Catholic Church is the organization against which the cohorts of Satan direct their attack. The army of the living God, the company that struggles against the enemies of Christ on earth, is not some amorphous group of persons who have what the world calls "faith," but the visible Catholic Church. When, by God's mercy, a man is changed from a sinner into a possessor of the life of grace, he is thereby transferred from the empire of Satan into the brotherhood of Christ. He comes within the Catholic Church either as a member or as one who wills to become a member. If he has not at least this latter sort of association with the company of Christ, he cannot have the life of grace which men hold only through contact with the Saviour.

Hence the force of the theological proof that the Church is truly necesssary for salvation will inevitably be destroyed in any exposition which plays down or confuses the teaching that the visible Catholic Church is actually the reality designated in the

Scriptures as the kingdom or the city or the household of God. The central point of the doctrine of the English-speaking Modernist was obviously a denial of the necessity of the Church. Hence we are not at all astonished to find a typical Modernist like Von Huegel distinguishing the Church from the kingdom.[22] It is unfortunate, however, to see a recent publication otherwise quite accurate bring forward the assertion that "the Church is not the City of God."[23]

Fortunately we have a passage from one of the encyclical letters of Pope Leo which presents this basic teaching clearly and accurately.

> The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse and opposite parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other for those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, namely, the true Church of Jesus Christ; and those who desire from their heart to be united with it, so as to gain salvation, must of necessity serve God and His only-begotten Son with their whole mind and with an entire will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose possession and control are all whosoever follow the fatal example of their leader and of our first parents, those who refuse to obey the divine and eternal law, and who have many aims of their own in contempt of God, and many aims also against God.
>
> This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects. . . .[24]

A recognition of the existence of these two kingdoms, and a realization of their position with reference to the process of eternal life and salvation, together with an awareness of the fact that the visible Catholic Church is truly the kingdom and the city of God

[22] Cf. Von Huegel, *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, 1921), I, 127.

[23] Cf. Dom Aelred Graham, *The Christ of Catholicism* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1947), p. 306.

[24] The encyclical *Humanum genus,* issued April 20, 1884. The translation is that of *The Great Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benzinger Brothers, 1903), p. 83.

on this earth: these are the elements which can give complete force and meaning to the theological proof of the axiom *"extra ecclesiam nulla salus."*

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington D. C.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for May, 1898, is an accout of St. John's Seminary, Boston from the pen of Fr. John A. Butler. The first building, he tells us, was opened in 1884, and to this was added a special house of Philosophy in 1892. Fr. Butler gives a detailed description of the curriculum and of the daily spiritual exercises of the seminarians. The library, he states, contains fifteen thousand volumes. [The present library at St. John's, vastly increased over that of a half-century ago, is one of the outstanding ecclesiastical libraries in America]. . . . The first instalment of *My New Curate,* the most popular clerical novel of Canon Sheehan, appears in this issue. Evidently the author preferred to remain anonymous, for the story is described as "gathered from stray leaves of an old diary by an Irish parish priest." [It is gratifying to note that it was *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* through its first editor, Fr. H. Heuser, that introduced the gifted parish priest of Doneraile to millions of enthusiastic readers in the United States]. . . . Fr. E. Taunton, beginning a series of articles on liturgy under the general title "Horae Liturgicae," emphasizes the importance of the study of liturgy in the seminary, and gives a brief description of the origin of the Roman rite and missal. . . . Abbé Hogan, continuing his series of "Clerical Studies," writes on the devotional use of the Bible by seminarians and priests. . . .In the *Analecta* we find the solution of a case presented to the Holy See. A young priest doubted the validity of his ordination, on the ground that he may not have had the intention of receiving Holy Orders because of his hesitancy as to his worthiness to enter the sacerdotal state. The Congregation of the Inquisition replied on Jan. 26, 1898, that he should regard himself as validly ordained. . . . The answer to a question states that a marriage entered into by a man under compulsion from a civil judge, as preferable to the infliction of a jail sentence because of the man's illicit relation with the girl, is to be considered valid. [The contrary seems the more commonly accepted opinion at the present day.]

F. J. C.

Answers to Questions

THE *CROTALUS* ON GOOD FRIDAY

Question: There seems to be considerable variety in the sounding of the clapper, which takes the place of the altar bell on Good Friday. Should it be rattled at the elevation of the Host in the Mass of the Presanctified? If so, definite instructions should be given the altar boys as the sequence of genuflections is different from that at the usual Solemn Mass. There seems to be no reason to sound it at the *Domine non sum dignus* as no one but the celebrant is to receive Holy Communion.

Answer: Believe it or not, there is no prescription requiring the use of the *crotalus,* or clapper, at the services of Good Friday. Neither the Missal nor the *Caeremoniale episcoporum* mentions it. The *Memoriale rituum* speaks of it only as an instrument to sound as a signal for the beginning of the ceremonies and says nothing of its use during the Mass of the Presanctified. Our U. S. *Ceremonial,* popularly known as the Baltimore Ceremonial, distinctly says that the clapper is not sounded at the elevation of which our correspondent speaks (Part IV, Chap. VII, Art. v, 8).

Even for the Mass of Holy Thursday, there is no rubrical direction that a clapper be used instead of the usual hand bell. The liturgical books simply say that the bells are not rung after the *Gloria* till the *Gloria* of the Mass on Holy Saturday. Custom, however, sanctions the sounding of the *crotalus* at the *Sanctus* and the elevation on Holy Thursday and some of the earlier authorities direct its use. *In praxi,* therefore, one is free to sound it or not, though it is undoubtedly more in accord with the general practice to use the clapper. This applies to Holy Thursday. For Good Friday it should not be sounded at all.

THE CUSHION FOR THE CROSS ON GOOD FRIDAY

Question: The Missal says simply that after the cross is uncovered on Good Friday, the celebrant takes it to the place prepared for it (*ad locum ante altare praeparatum.*) The general custom seems to be to to have the cross rest on a cushion which is placed in the middle of the steps of the altar. Is there anything more definite

prescribed by the rubrics or the decrees of the Congregation of Rites?

Answer: There is a more definite prescription of the rubrics concerning the resting place of the cross for the ceremony of adoration on Good Friday. It is found in the *Memoriale rituum* (Tit. V, Cap. I, and Cap. II, ii) where it is directed that there be a rectangular carpet, on which a fine violet cushion is to be placed and then covered with a white silk veil, edged with, or interwoven with, violet, on which the cross is to rest while it is being kissed by the clergy and others. The precise place where this cushion, with its carpet and veil, is to be stationed to receive the cross is not more definitely stated than the prescription that it be in front of the altar (*ante altare*), in the words of the Missal. Authors generally direct that the carpet be spread with its upper portion on the lowest step, then the cushion covered with the white veil rest on the carpet and against the lowest step. The rubric of the *Memoriale rituum* presumes an inclined position for the cushion as it advises the use of cords to tie the cross to the cushion, if such precaution be necessary. In any case, carpet, cushion and veil are definite official prescriptions but their position in the sanctuary may vary with any disposition which satisfies the direction that they be *ante altare.*

THE RELATIVE TIME OF BAPTISM AND "CHURCHING"

Question: Is it required by Church law that the child be baptized before the mother may present herself for the ceremony commonly called "churching"?

Answer: There is no prescription of ecclesiastical law requiring that a child be already baptized before its mother may lawfully present herself for the blessing after childbirth, or, as it is usually termed, for the ceremony of "churching." Since, however, the *Codex juris* (canon 770) requires that baptism be conferred *quamprimum* and moralists (e.g. Sabetti-Barrett, 662, q. 7) consider that a delay of over three weeks constitutes grave matter, ordinarily the child will be baptized before the mother receives this blessing.

CLERGY *IN CHORO* STAND DURING DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNION

Question: When Holy Communion is distributed at Solemn Mass, should the clergy assisting in the sanctuary kneel or remain standing?

Answer: Martinucci (Lib. I, Cap. iii, 72) directs that only those *in choro* who are going to receive Holy Communion are to kneel from the time of the preparatory *Confiteor*. Others of the clergy remain standing. So also, Fortescue (*Ceremonies,* p. 138) and the "Baltimore" *Ceremonial* (Part III, Chap. 1, Art. ii, n). Obviously, those of the clergy about to receive Holy Communion, after kneeling for the *Confiteor, Misereatur,* and *Indulgentiam,* rise to proceed two by two to kneel on the edge of the predella for the actual reception of Holy Communion.

MORE ON THE RE-BURIAL OF VETERANS

In the January, 1948, issue of *AER,* p. 61, we gave as our opinion that for final burial of the bodies of veterans, and this applies to the re-burial of other persons, the proper Mass would be that *in die obitus seu depositionis.* This naturally means that when the deceased is a priest or bishop the Mass to be said is that of All Souls' Day, the first Mass assigned in the Missal for Nov. 2, with the proper orations. For the laity and for clerics below the rank of presbyter, the Requiem Mass *in die obitus* should be said. We were more concerned with the quality of the Mass to be celebrated than the days on which such a Mass would be permitted. A correspondent has kindly called our attention to a decree of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, dated June 16, 1922, which decided that all the privileges of the funeral Mass as to the day of celebration were not to be extended to the Requiem Mass said on the occasion of the re-burial of a person, who had been interred previously with the usual exequial Mass. The Sacred Congregation, while allowing the Mass *in die obitus seu depositionis* to be said on such an occasion, limited the days on which it might be said to those mentioned in *Additiones et variationes in rubricis missalis,* Tit. III, 6, which are those permitting Requiem Masses on the third, seventh, and thirtieth days after death or burial, and on the anniversary day, as well as on the most convenient day *post acceptum mortis nuntium.*

The funeral Requiem Mass, therefore, to be said at the re-burial of persons brought from a former place of interment is allowed on all days of the year, except the following: Sundays, holy days of obligation even if suppressed, All Souls' Day, all feasts of the first or second class even when transferred, Ash Wednesday, all the days of Holy Week, the privileged vigils of Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, and during the privileged octaves of Christmas, Epiphany, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Corpus Christi, and the Sacred Heart.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

AN ORGANIST'S PROBLEM

Question: A Catholic girl was hired by an undertaker to play the organ at services for the deceased conducted in his funeral parlor. May she act as organist indiscriminately at all funeral services, no matter for whom or by whom they are conducted?

Answer: If she is called on to participate in a service of a Catholic nature for a deceased Catholic, of course she could comply. Thus, if she is asked to play a hymn before or after the Rosary recited by the friends of the deceased the night before the funeral, she could accede to the request. On the other hand, it is difficult to see how she could play the organ for any rite conducted by a non-Catholic clergyman (whatever may have been the religion of the deceased) for that would seem to be active participation in a public non-Catholic religious service, which is always forbidden (Canon 1258, §1). Now, it is true, it is not *per se* wrong for a Catholic to participate actively in *private* devotions conducted by non-Catholics, provided nothing contrary to Catholic faith is expressed or implied (cf. Bancroft, *Communication in Religious Worship with non-Catholics* [Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1943] p. 85), and some might argue that the service in the circumstances visualized is only an act of private devotion. But it would seem to me that the mere fact that a non-Catholic clergyman conducts a religious service, even though it takes place outside the church and consists of only an informal rite—for example, a sermon, some hymns and extemporaneous prayer—makes the service public. This would seem to be unquestionable, at least if the clergyman is of an evangelical sect, since this informal, non-liturgical type of service would be his

usual manner of giving public worship. Perhaps a service of this informal type conducted by an Episcopalian clergyman, who has a recognized ceremonial for public cult, could be regarded as an act of private worship.

In the supposition that the organist is asked to render her services at a funeral ceremony conducted for a non-Catholic by a layman—usually the undertaker himself—a distinction must be made. If this person follows a recognized non-Catholic ceremonial, such as that which is found in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, the ceremony would seem to be public, so that the girl would not be allowed to play the organ. However, if the lay person conducts the type of funeral rite designated above as informal—an extemporary prayer, a few words of comfort, etc.—it would seem possible to consider it a private devotional exercise, and in that case *per se* the girl could participate, as long as it contains nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine. *Per accidens,* however, this could be illicit—namely, if in the particular circumstances she ran the risk of giving grave scandal because many would think that she was guilty of forbidden *communicatio in sacris.*

THE CIVIL OFFICIAL AT AN INVALID MARRIAGE

Question: May a Catholic justice of the peace officiate at a civil marriage when one (at least) of the parties is a Catholic?

Answer: Evidently the questioner is concerned with a case in which the marriage will be invalid on the ground that there is no authorized priest present to ask and receive the consent of the parties. For, by virtue of Canon 1098, there are occasions on which two Catholics can be married validly in the presence of two witnesses, without any priest, and if a Catholic justice of the peace is asked to be present at such a marriage (either as one of the witnesses or in his official capacity to assure the recognition of the marriage by civil law) he may do so without any hesitation. Moreover, we are not concerned here with the case of the man in public office who officiates at the civil marriage of Catholics in a country where this ceremony must precede the ecclesiastical marriage. Of course, a Catholic judge or mayor may perform his official function on an occasion of this nature, at least if there is a presumption that the Catholics who appear before him will immediately go

to the priest for their real marriage. If he has good reason to believe that this will not be done, his case is to be solved on the principles given below.

The practical problem as we encounter it in our land is that of the justice of the peace (or judge, mayor, or other official authorized by the state to officiate at a marriage ceremony) who is approached by a couple with the request that he marry them, and who knows that such a ceremony would be invalid, because one (at least) of the parties is a Catholic, bound to the ecclesiastical form under pain of nullity of the marriage. At times there may be an additional circumstance, such as the presence of an impediment (particularly the bond of a previous marriage) but this would not substantially alter the matter. The basic problem is: "May a Catholic civil official assist in his public capacity at a civil marriage, when one (at least) of the parties is a Catholic and the official knows that the marriage will not be valid?"

Gasparri (*Tractatus canonicus de matrimonio* [Rome, 1932], II, n. 1300) asserts that some authorities have regarded such assistance as intrinsically wrong; but he cites none of these authorities by name. However, he himself argues that the assistance of the official is not intrinsically wrong, and this view seems sufficiently probable to be accepted in practice. For the participation of the official would seem to be material, not formal, co-operation; so that, for a proportionately grave reason (a reason, namely, that is proportionate to the evil effect of his co-operation and the scandal that might arise) he would be allowed to perform his official function. Evidently, the reasons must be very weighty, for the co-operation is quite proximate, and the danger of scandal very grave. De Smet (*De sponsalibus et matrimonio* [Bruges, 1927], n. 406) and Damen (*Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1947], II, n. 863) agree with Gasparri.

Ordinarily in the United States there would not be sufficient reason for a Catholic official to assist at a marriage of this nature, for usually he could refuse to lend his services without suffering any grave loss thereby. Certainly, the mere fact that he would thus deprive himself of the honorarium or would lose the friendship of the parties requesting his services would not constitute sufficient reasons for acceding to the request. On the other hand, if there is danger that he might lose his position in the event of a refusal,

he could participate, for it is surely to the advantage of society that good, conscientious men hold public office. It should be noted that these same principles should be applied when those who seek to be married are non-Catholics bound by an impediment—for example, when one is a divorced person with his lawful spouse still living. Moreover, the civil official should take measures to manifest his disapproval of marriages attempted in violation of the laws of God or of the Church, and, when it is feasible, should endeavor to induce those who are planning such unions to desist from their project.

A PROBLEM IN JUSTICE

Question: Does an automobile dealer fail against justice if he buys a new car, drives it a few miles, then sells it as a used car? I am supposing that the government has set a ceiling price on new cars, but not on used cars, so that by the procedure described the dealer is enabled to charge a much higher price for the car—after it has been driven only a short distance—than if it were sold as it came from the factory.

Answer: It is generally admitted that *per se* a dealer fails against commutative justice when he demands of the buyer a price higher than that established by law (cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Rome, 1947], I, n. 925). However in going through the process which the questioner describes, (i.e., the use of the car for a brief trip) the dealer would seem to free himself from the obligation of submitting to the legal price (the ceiling price, as we call it) set down for a new car. For, since the law does not stipulate the amount of use required to make a car "used," the dealer can consider the car no longer in the category of new cars. Hence he would not be guilty of sin by considering himself free from the legal obligation of the ceiling price, after he has driven it a short distance.

However, it is more difficult to justify the dealer in the matter of the actual sale of the car. There is no legal price determined for his "used" car; hence the just price is that which is known as the *pretium vulgare,* the price which intelligent and honest people commonly regard as reasonable, taking into consideration the value of the material, the workmanship, a fair profit for the dealer, etc. There are degrees of this price, known as the *infimum, medium,* and *summum,* though it is sometimes difficult to determine these

gradations for a particular product. But at any rate, it is an admitted principle that a dealer is guilty of a violation of commutative justice if he demands a price above the *summum pretium vulgare*, unless some special title happens to be present in an individual instance (cf. Damen, *op. cit.*, I, n. 926). Now the mere fact that the buyer is in great need of the commodity and is willing to pay an exorbitant price because he cannot otherwise obtain it, does not constitute a special title, permitting the seller to raise the price (at least, if the addition is considerable).

Accordingly, if the automobile dealer demands more for his "used" car than he could legally get for it when it was new, he would still be free from injustice if the greater price is sufficiently moderate to be classed as a just one by honest and intelligent men who know what expense has gone into the making and the purchase of the car and what profit the dealer will make. But, if the price is such that he will make an exorbitant profit—and it would seem that such is not an uncommon occurrence today—the dealer is guilty of a sin against commutative justice which involves the obligation of making restitution to those whom he has wronged of at least as much as will bring down their expenditure to the *pretium vulgare summum*.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

THE FIRST CATHOLIC CHAPLAINS IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY

The Catholic soldiers in Taylor's army were not silent under their wrongs. Their remonstrances reached Washington; the religious press took up their cause warmly, and public opinion pronounced in their favor. President Polk asked the bishops assembled in Council [the sixth Provincial Council of Baltimore, in 1846] to name two chaplains for the troops. The prelates advised the government to apply to the Society of Jesus, a provincial of which resided at Georgetown, at the very doors of the capitol. The provincial chose for this post of honor two of the most eminent Fathers of the Society—Father John McElroy and Father Anthony Rey. Although policy had a considerable share in this act of justice, President Polk is entitled to the gratitude of Catholics for affording the troops the consolations of their religion amid the peril of war.

—From the *History of the Catholic Church in the United States*, by Henry De Courcy and John Gilmary Shea (New York: P. J. Kenedy, 1879), p. 160.

Analecta

The inadequacy of a defensive attitude on the part of the faithful and the need for the adoption of an energetic attack on irreligion was emphasized by our Holy Father both in his allocution to the representatives of Italian Catholic Action on Sept. 7, 1947,[1] and in his allocution to the delegates of the International Union of Sodalities delivered four days later.[2] In both allocutions he also insisted on the necessity of preserving the Christian family and of co-operating in the promotion of social justice in accordance with the doctrines of the Church. He insisted on the remedy for spiritual anemia, namely, the food offered by faith and the sacraments, in speaking to the representatives of Catholic Action; in addressing the delegates of the Sodalities he pointed to the extreme difficulty of preserving purity without faith and the support it brings. He told the representatives of Catholic Action to be generous and not to resent the efforts of others aiming at the triumph of Christian principles. He warned the delegates of the Sodalities to beware of "the perils of the heart," to which he traced the acceptance of euthanasia, of divorce, and of an atheistic materialism vainly promising the exaltation of the weak. To the men of Catholic Action he denounced the post-war speculation that was wreaking havoc on the entire people. To the delegates of the Sodalities he commended as a serious obligation the exercise of their political rights in the defense of the cause of God and of the Church. At the end of both allocutions, he conferred the Apostolic Blessing on those present, their families, and all who were dear to them.

Besides these two allocutions, the latest numbers of the *Acta Apostalicae Sedis* (October and November, 1947) contain, among other documents, the letter of our Holy Father to the President of *Semaines Sociales,* written in view of its convention in Paris and dated July 18, 1947,[3] commending the general theme of discussion adopted for the meeting, "Social Catholicism and the Great Contemporaneous Trends." Again he insisted on the importance of courageous translation of Catholic conviction into action

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXXIX (1947), 425.
[2] *Ibid.,* p. 480.
[3] *Ibid.,* p. 444.

in the entire domain of both public and private life, repudiating the attitude of those who would restrict the Church's action to the improvement only of the private life of the individual. In this letter, moreover, he took occasion to refer to the misunderstanding to which certain persons subjected his remarks on nationalization on the occasion of the previous year's meeting. He insisted that those statements had no political significance of a particular kind, but were only a repetition of the doctrine of the Church as enunciated in the encyclical *Quadragesimo anno,* of his predecessor, and as expressed by himself under other circumstances and in greater detail.

Another letter with social implications is that addressed by our Holy Father on Aug. 31, 1947,[4] to the President of *Semaines Sociales* of Canada, written in view of its twenty-fourth session at Rimouski. The letter is marked by its eulogy of the place held by the farmer in the economic life of the nation, showing to what extent political health is based upon a strong farm population. It notes how the land brings a man closer to God and makes it easier for him to be religious and to comply with the moral law; but it notes that the Pope is concerned, as the meeting in Rimouski must be, with the improvement of the economic state of the farmer and of the latter's agricultural techniques, in order that his interests may be justly preserved and that the exodus from the farm may be checked.

On Sept. 5, 1947,[5] our Holy Father delivered a radio message to the Marian congress at Maastricht, in which he observed that the Blessed Virgin had arranged this occasion that he might address to the faithful assembled there, whose faith is known in the entire world, a paternal word of greeting and of praise for the century of progress made by the Church in Holland. Again he stressed the need of a constant improvement in the religious life of the faithful and of an increasing loyalty to Christian principles affecting marriage, the family, social justice, and charity. The Cardinal Archbishop of Utrecht was the Papal Legate at this Congress in virtue of an appointment contained in the letter of our Holy Father of Aug. 15, 1947.[6]

In his allocution to the Auditors of the Sacred Roman Rota on Oct. 29, 1947,[7] our Holy Father continued his series based on

[4] *Ibid.,* p. 478. [5] *Ibid.,* p. 456. [6] *Ibid.,* p. 451. [7] *Ibid.,* p. 493.

the differences between the judicial functions in the Church and in the State. In previous allocutions he had pointed to the contrast in origin and nature and in the object of the respective judical powers. In this allocution he developed the contrast in purpose, showing that the function of the ecclesiastical judge is to promote the eternal welfare of the faithful. This purpose saves him from a rigidity based on a fear of responsibility, or in indolence, or even on an ill conceived concern for the security of the law, to which merely earthly institutions are subject. On the other hand, he proceeds, not arbitrarily, moved by anti-intellectual impulse, but acting under the law, applying its principles to the individual case. Our Holy Father expressed his understanding of the difficulties which the auditors were compelled to encounter as a result of the errors of modern times. In closing, he bestowed upon them the Apostolic Blessing.

On Sept. 18, 1947,[8] our Holy Father preached in honor of the fourteenth centenary of the death of St. Benedict. The sermon was delivered in the Patriarchal Basilica of St. Paul Outside the Walls. In the course of the homily he saluted the newly elected Abbot Primate; he praised the missionary efforts of the Benedictines through which so much of Europe was converted to the Faith; he spoke of the wisdom of Leo XIII in promoting the monastic congregations; and he urged the monks assembled to bring about a restoration of culture in the harried times of the present as they had done in the past in similar eras of catastrophe.

By Letters Apostolic of July 30, 1946,[9] our Holy Father raised to the dignity of a minor basilica the Church of St. Victor, Martyr, in the town of Missaglia, of the Archdiocese of Milan. The description of the edifice in the Letters demonstates that it is of a most imposing character; besides describing the precious character of the materials of which it and its altars are constructed, the Letters indicate its size as great enough to admit four thousand persons.

By a letter of April 12, 1947,[10] our Holy Father appointed as his Legate to the Sanctuary of Our Lady of Monte Serrato in Spain, His Eminence, Manuel Cardinal Arce y Ochotorena, Archbishop of Tarragonna.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 452. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 439. [10] *Ibid.*, p. 442.

Three other letters of our Holy Father were congratulatory. One of these, dated Aug. 7, 1947,[11] extended the Apostolic Blessing to all who should take part in the ceremonies marking the fourth centenary of the death of St. Cajetan of Thiene, co-founder with John Peter Caraffa (later Paul IV) of the Clerks Regular known as Theatines. Another letter, dated Aug. 6, 1947,[12] was sent to His Eminence, Joseph Ernest Cardinal Van Roey, Archbishop of Malines, to congratulate him on the fiftieth anniversary of his ordination. A third was sent on Oct. 2, 1947,[13] to felicitate His Eminence, Domenico Cardinal Jorio, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments, on the obeservance of his eightieth birthday anniversary.

Allocutions were delivered by our Holy Father to the following representatives of foreign powers on the occasion on which they presented their credentials: on Oct. 17, 1947,[14] to the representative of Egypt; on Oct. 28, 1947,[15] to the representative of El Salvador; and on Nov. 1, 1947,[16] to the representative of Bolivia.

Several Apostolic Constitutions have made changes in the territorial boundaries of ecclesiastical subdivisions. One, dated May 8, 1947,[17] established the Prefecture Apostolic of Northern Nyassa from territory taken from the Vicariate Apostolic of Nyassa in British East Africa. Another, dated June 12, 1947,[18] established the Prefecture Apostolic of Nouna from territory taken from the Prefecture Apostolic of Gao in French West Africa. A third, dated June 12, 1947,[19] established the Prefecture Apostolic of Sikasso from territory taken from the Vicariate Apostolic of Bobo-Dioulasso. A fourth, dated June 12, 1947,[20] raised the Prefecture Apostolic of Accra to the rank of a Vicariate Apostolic, adding to its territory the district of Akimo, previously taken from the Vicariate Apostolic of the Gold Coast. A fifth, dated June 12, 1947,[21] established the Prefecture Apostolic of Kayes from territory taken from the Vicariate Apostolic of Bamako in French West Africa. A sixth, dated May 25, 1947,[22] took territory from the Archdiocese of Glasgow, giving a portion of it to the Diocese of Galloway and establishing from the remainder two new Dioceses, those of

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 448.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 447.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 452.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 488.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 491.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 498.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 432.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 433.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 435.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 436.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 438.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 473.

Motherwell and Paisley. A seventh, dated May 25, 1947,[23] established the Archdiocese of Glasgow as a Metropolitan See with the suffragan Sees of Motherwell and Paisley. A decree of the Sacred Consistorial Congregation, dated Jan. 18, 1947,[24] provided for transfer of three towns from the Diocese of Monopoli to the Diocese of Conversano.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, dated June 8, 1947,[25] changed the name of the Apostolic Delegation of Australasia to that of the Apostolic Delegation of Australia, New Zealand, and Oceania; this modification resulted from the establishment of an Apostolic Delegation with supervision over part of the territory that had previously been under the supervision of the Apostolic Delegate of Australasia. A decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated July 17, 1947,[26] appointed Most Rev. Patrick J. Byrne, of the Maryknoll Fathers, Apostolic Visitator of Korea, with the authority of an Apostolic Delegate during his term of office. A decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated June 12, 1947,[27] changed the boundaries between the Vicariates Apostolic of Beni and Kivu in the Belgian Congo. A decree of the same Sacred Congregation of the same date[28] separated from the Vicariate Apostolic of the Gold Coast the district of Akim; this district was joined on the same date to the Vicariate Apostolic of Accra by the Apostolic Constitution to which reference was made in the preceding paragraph. A decree of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, dated July 10, 1947,[29] entrusted to the Franciscans the Prefecture Apostolic of Misurata, in Northern Africa, established in 1939. A decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated July 10, 1947,[30] provided for the assigning of certain portions of the Vicariate Apostolic of Majunga to the Prefecture Apostolic of Ambanja.

A response of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, dated Oct. 22, 1947,[31] reports the reply of our Holy Father asserting that the recently published translation of the Psalms may be used in daily prayers, including the Divine Office and other liturgical and extra-liturgical prayers, but only for the recitation or the singing of entire Psalms outside Mass.

[23] *Ibid.*, p. 476.
[24] *Ibid.*, p. 500.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 501.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 463.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 460.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 461.
[29] *Ibid.*
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 462.
[31] *Ibid.*, p. 508.

A decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated June 5, 1947,[32] provided that in consideration of the proof of the two miracles required, it is safe to proceed to the beatification of Brother Benildus, a Brother of the Christian Schools. A decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated June 13, 1947,[33] provided for the introduction of the cause of the servant of God, Frances Streitel, Foundress of the Institute of the Sorrowful Mother; and another decree, dated Aug. 3, 1947,[34] provided for the introduction of the cause of Sixtus Cardinal Riario, of the house of Sforza.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE *ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS*

Protonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium:

Nov. 18, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward J. Hickey, of the Archdiocese of Detroit.

Jan. 18, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgr. James F. McGloin, of the Diocese of Buffalo.

Domestic Prelates of His Holiness:

Sept. 25, 1945: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Cornelius Murphy, Gerald O'Driscoll, and James Vaughan, of the Diocese of Sacramento.

Feb. 10, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John T. Creagh and Matthew J. Flaherty, of the Archdiocese of Boston.

June 2, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul J. Glenn, of the Diocese of Columbus.

Nov. 9, 1946: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Robert F. Coburn, Henry J. Kellerman, and Patrick J. Kilgallen, of the Diocese of Columbus.

Feb. 15, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Patrick J. Ryan, of the Archdiocese of St. Paul; and John Cavanagh, of the Diocese of Sioux Falls.

March 23, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. William Devlin, James Empey, John Lambe, Daniel Murphy, John Sibon, George Smith, and John Smith, of the Diocese of Reno.

March 27, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph A. Corrigan, John Cullinan, Vincent Worzalla, John Dunphy, James Zachman, and Alois Ziskovsky, of the Archdiocese of St. Paul.

April 22, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph F. Govaert and Edward L. Stephens, of the Diocese of Richmond.

May 6, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Edward Geraghty and F. A. Meyer, of the Diocese of Fargo.

---

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 463. [33] *Ibid.*, p. 502. [34] *Ibid.*, p. 504.

May 10, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John K. Ryan, of the Diocese of Winona.

May 21, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Gerald Dugan, Edward J. Fischer, Daniel E. Fitzpatrick, Edward P. McManaman, Victor F. Miller and James Murphy, of the Diocese of Erie.

May 25, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. John W. Becka, Edward B. Conry, Francis B. Duda, Richard P. Gibbons, Robert B. Navin, John T. Ruffing, John W. Schmitz, and Augustin Tomasek, of the Diocese of Cleveland; Dominic Blasco, Joseph Boudreaux, William J. Castel, Edward C. Pendergast, Joseph P. Pyzikiewicz, Maurice Schexnayder, and Joseph A. Wester, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans; George J. Bedford, William M. Burke, Stephen A. Cummins, Robert I. Falvey, Richard H. Hammond, Henry J. Lyne, John McGarr, Richard A. O'Donnell, John V. Silva, and Egisto Tozzi, of the Archdiocese of San Francisco.

June 20, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Joseph M. Griffin, of the Diocese of Hartford; Napoleon J. Raymond, of the Diocese of Marquette.

August 1, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgrs. Edmund R. Cody, James F. Gresl, Kenneth F. Rowe, and Joseph M. Verhoeven, of the Diocese of Boise City; Michael J. Coffey, Matthew J. Gleason, Patrick J. Lydon, John E. O'Connell, Thomas A. Quinlan, and Casimir Urbanowicz, of the Archdiocese of Boston; Alexander P. Landry, and John L. Plunkett, of the Diocese of Ogdensburg; Joseph P. Momoreton, of the Diocese of Salt Lake; and Howard McDowell, of the Diocese of Syracuse.

Aug. 23, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward Swanstrom, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Papal Chamberlains Supernumerary of His Holiness:

May 21, 1947: Very Rev. Msgrs. John M. Gannon, William M. Franklin, Robert B. McDonald, and James M. Powers, of the Diocese of Erie.

May 25, 1947: Very Rev. Msgrs. Charles F. Beauvais, Charles J. Plauché, and Robert E. Tracy, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

July 4, 1947: Very Rev. Msgrs. Robert Brennan, John Devlin, Raymond O'Flaherty, George M. Scott, Joseph Truxaw, and Edward Wade, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Aug. 1, 1947: Very Rev. Msgrs. Augustine C. Dalton, Daniel J. Donovan, Walter J. Leach, and Thomas J. Riley, of the Archdiocese of Boston; and Francis P. Devan, of the Diocese of Ogdensburg.

Aug. 23, 1947: Very Rev. Msgr. James C. Hardiman, of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Papal Chamberlain of the Cap and Sword Supernumerary of His Holiness:

June 20, 1947: Giovenale Marchisio, of the Diocese of Brooklyn.

Commander of the Order of St. Gregory the Great, civil class:

Nov. 15, 1946: James R. Dougherty of the Diocese of Corpus Christi.

Feb. 11, 1947: Clarence Dolan, of the Diocese of Gallup.

Knight of the Order of Gregory the Great, civil class:

April 28, 1946: Robert F. M. McGrory, Robert E. Mulholland, John J. Rafferty, and Goffred W. Schroth, of the Diocese of Trenton.

June 6, 1946: John O'Keefe, of the Diocese of Natchez.

Nov. 15, 1946: John J. Kennedy, of the Diocese of Corpus Christi; Edward J. Hickey, John J. McKeon, and Matthew S. Reynold, of the Diocese of Hartford.

Jan. 20, 1947: John Deblieux, Leonardo Garcia, Robert Hunter, Cliffe E. Laborde, Frank Looney, Norris McGowen, Le Doux Provosty, and Wilfrid Barry, of the Diocese of Alexandria.

Feb. 11, 1947: James J. Norris, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

May 14, 1947: Charles L. Corcoran, Thomas Couglin, John Crew, James J. Murray, Herman R. Neff, and Martin J. O'Donnell, of the Diocese of Cleveland; George Back, James Burton, James Robaszkiewicz, and John Spaeder, of the Diocese of Erie.

May 25, 1947: Frederick J. Bahlinger, Charles J. Denechaud, Rapier E. Desforges, Francis L. Knobloch, and Thomas F. Regan, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

BEHIND THE VEIL OF CREATURES

We can behold God in all things, hidden behind the curtain of created nature. For all created things are as a veil concealing His presence; yet through that veil a glimpse at least of the glory beneath may be obtained. This is the prerogative of the clean of heart who, our Lord tells us, "shall see God" (Matt. 5:8), face to face in the life to come, but even here below in a way better than others.

—*My God and My All,* by the Ven. Leonard Lessius, S.J., translated by John L. Forster, S. J. (Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1948), pp. 14 f.

Book Reviews

THE MAN ON JOSS STICK ALLEY. By James E. Walsh. New York and Toronto: Longmans, Green and Company, 1947. Pp. 146. $2.75.

It is now nearly forty years since the happy combination of Father James A. Walsh of the Archdiocese of Boston and Thomas F. Price of the Vicariate of North Carolina brought into being the Catholic Foreign Mission Society of America and thus laid the foundations for one of the glories of the Church of the United States in the twentieth century. This little volume of Bishop Walsh, successor to his namesake as superior general of Maryknoll, tells the story of Daniel L. McShane, Maryknoll's first vocation from the seminaries of the United States and the first priest ordained for the society. Fr. McShane, born in Columbus, Indiana, in 1888, attended St. Joseph's College at Rensselaer and later St. Mary's Seminary in Baltimore. It was at the latter institution that the young lad found the inspiration for his special work in the priesthood through a lecture delivered at the old Paca Street seminary by Fr. Price. He had previously thought of becoming a Trappist but had postponed his entry to Gethsemane in Kentucky at the suggestion of his priest-brother.

Fr. McShane was a member of the original student body of Maryknoll Seminary and was ordained by Cardinal Farley in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, on Nov. 10, 1914. For the next few years he assisted in Maryknoll schools in the United States while the fury of World War I made it impractical to attempt the foreign missions. But at length peace came and in October, 1919, Fr. McShane with two other Maryknollers arrived in China to carry on the work which had been inaugurated by Fr. Price who had died there the month before their arrival. From this time on to Fr. McShane's premature death on June 4, 1927, at the age of thirty-nine, Bishop Walsh traces with great understanding and sympathy the difficult life of this splendid American priest among the Chinese. The book is written in a popular vein with interesting discourses on the life of a boy in the average American parochial school (pp. 8-12), on the experiences of the rider of a sedan chair in China (pp. 42-44), etc. The reader is given an appreciation of the almost insuperable difficulties faced by the missioners in the way of learning the Chinese dialects, counteracting mischief makers among the native populace, warding off bandits,—and probably the most severe cross of all—battling against the loneliness and the temptation to discouragement that is the lot of every missioner.

Fr. McShane's particular efforts were directed to the rescue of aban-

doned Chinese babies. He could not make great headway with the adults so he began taking these pitiful little waifs at the rate of around four hundred a year. At the end of five years he had received into his orphanage, conducted by the Maryknoll Sisters, nearly two thousand babies, only thirty little girls of whom survived (p. 101). By the time the babies were found disease and exposure had gone so far in their evil effects that the mortality rate was altogether staggering. In fact, it was from the 2483rd baby admitted to his orphanage that Fr. MSchane contracted smallpox and died at his Loting mission in June, 1927, having not yet reached his fortieth year. The story of his lonely struggle at the end with the dread disease is a fascinating and edifying one. Dr. Dickson of the American Presbyterian mission in Loting attended Fr. McShane in his last illness and gave a beautiful example of Christian charity which brought comment from the dying priest in the final letter of his life, scribbled in pencil five days before his death: "Doctor Dickson has been especially kind to me" (p. 141). The book closes with a glossary of Far Eastern terms and has eight pages of the kind of photographs for which Maryknoll is justly famed. There is no index.

Bishop Walsh's simple biography is worthy of the Maryknoll tradition. It will make edifying reading for American priests everywhere and it will sharpen the appetite of all lovers of Maryknoll for the day when the definitive history of this great American Catholic missionary effort will be told in full detail.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

THE SAVING SENSE. By Walter Dwight, S.J. Edited with Introduction by W. Coleman Nevils, S.J. New York: Declan X. McMullen Co., 1947. Pp. 240. $2.75.

This interesting volume is well-titled, and it appears at a time when its usefulness will be apparent to the thoughtful reader. In these days of world travail, we must all sometimes escape from the gloom of global confusion. It is a mistake, however, to seek our recreation in the altogether trivial forms of diversion. An appropriate seriousness should charaterize our available enjoyment of life threatened by the abuse of atomic energy. This collection of essays affords an opportunity for such relaxation, and it is recommended to those who have the "saving sense" of humor and who would preserve a saving sense of balance.

The introduction itself is a summary biographical essay of merit. It aptly evaluates the author of what follows and provides an adequately suggestive approach thereto. Fr. Dwight, though now dead some twenty years, was a man both humorous and holy, a combination of traits too infrequently realized and the more to be appreciated when it occurs.

The present selection of his literary works was motivated by a desire to show and utilize the timelessness of his content, howsoever light its vein. For, while the topics may remind us of Charles Lamb, the style of treatment being also of similar value, we are never permitted to forget the supernatural aspects of the subjects and the virtues which should be applied in even our more mundane preoccupations. The moralizing, however, is not intrusive, and there is no pulpit-to-pew flavor in its fashioning.

In all, the matter is suitable for casual spiritual reading and provides both a pleasant and a profitable interlude to the tiring intensity of current life-problems. The book is well printed, and while an index is always desirable, its lack herein is no great defect.

GERALD A. RYAN

CATHOLIC AUTHORS. Edited By Very Reverend Matthew Hoehn, O.S.B., B. L. S. Newark, N. J.: St. Mary's Abbey Press, 1948. Pp. 812. $10.00.

This long and eagerly awaited biographical dictionary is a monument to the industry, patience, and skill in research of its editor. Begun eight years ago it followed a carefully laid plan which World War II, though slowing down the completion of the enterprise, failed to disrupt. Something of the magnitude of the task is revealed by a few figures. The 812-page work contains the biographies of 620 authors, all but twenty accompanied by portraits. Data were gathered as a result of more than five thousand letters and of careful research in virtually all the outstanding libraries, public and institutional, in the country. From the material collected over sixty assistants were engaged to help write the sketches.

The volume is confined to those authors who profess the Catholic Faith. Some have died since 1930 but they are included along with those still living. To assure accuracy each biographer was requested to verify his sketch before publication. In the case of those deceased since 1930 this office was performed by relatives or intimate friends. Fr. Hoehn's researches took him all over the country, and important information was often secured only by a personal visit to the authors themselves.

The volume gains greatly in importance from the fact that it is not confined to Catholic writers born or domiciled in the United States or even to British and Irish authors of the Faith but includes many from continental Europe at least one of whose works has been translated into English.

The technique adopted before the 620 writers were decided on was

carefully followed. After a preliminary screening a list of sixteen hundred was submitted to editors, literary critics, and librarians who, acting independently, selected those they considered best qualified. From this list the final choices were made. The completed volume makes no attempt at critical appraisals of a writer's works nor does the editor stamp all of them as entirely representative of Catholic thought or doctrine. Such a course would be impossible since many converts are listed who were writing for years before they entered the Church.

The number of converts indeed is impressive, 137 (twenty-two percent). Religious include 224 priests, twenty-three sisters, and one brother. Nationally, American writers predominate with 337, followed by 141 English, thirty-eight French, thirty-six Irish, twenty German, and fifteen Canadian. Additional figures are: Scots, Austrians, and Italians four each; Poles, Australians, and Spaniards three each; Danes and Russians two each. Chile, the Philippines, New Zealand, Iceland, Ceylon, China, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, and Norway have one each. Of family names, Walsh leads with ten.

The sketches average about seven hundred words in length but range from 2100 words to one tenth that number. Among the longer biographies are those of Chesterton, Lord Douglas, Johannes Jörgensen, Sheila Kaye-Smith, Arnold Lunn, Jaques Maritain, and Paul Claudel.

A sampling taken almost at random might easily include notables as divergent in personality, chief interests, and race as appear in the following: Charles Sears Baldwin, Professor of English at Yale and later at Columbia, scholar and writer; Max Jordon, born in Italy, educated in Germany, writer, lecturer, European representative for NBC, and now director of its Division of Religious Broadcasts; Abbé Felix Klein, brilliant and many-sided, who sought by his writings to bridge the profound valley which separates the Age from the Church, who has done so much to strengthen Franco-American friendship, and whose works have been crowned by the French Academy; Evelyn Waugh, Oxford educated novelist and man of letters, whose much discussed *Brideshead Revisited* contains some of the most memorable scenes in contemporary fiction; Louis Madelin, doctor of letters from the University of Paris, eminent historian whose history of the French Revolution won the Grand Prix Gobert; Oliver St. John Gogarty, Irishman, physician, wit, poet, and friend of Yeats who esteemed his lyric gift highly; Sigrid Undset, Norwegian, convert, novelist, and student of the middle ages, whose trilogy, *Kristin Lafransdatter,* remains the greatest masterpiece of fiction ever writen by a woman; Maria Montessori, world famous educator, born in Italy, the first woman to receive the degree of M.D. from the University of Rome; Achmed Abdullah, born in Russia of an Orthodox father and a Moslem mother, educated in England, France, Ger-

many, and Eygpt, convert, soldier, poet, linguist, dramatist and writer of distinguished fiction.

In compiling *Catholic Authors* its editor, Fr. Hoehn, had in mind the needs of educators and librarians. Students of literature both elementary and advanced and those interested in cultural backgrounds will also find this work not only authoritative but a veritable gold mine. Even the casual reader will come in for numerous surprises for he will discover names whose possessors he never dreamed were Catholic and of whose carreers and achievements he will be glad to learn. Even the busy man of affairs who spends an occasional hour with Fr. Hoehn's notable volume will enjoy an exciting and highly informative experience.

In a word, *Catholic Authors* is a must volume which seems certain to acheive the success it so clearly deserves.

JOSEPH J. REILLY

THE LIFE OF JAMES ROOSEVELT BAYLEY, FIRST BISHOP OF NEWARK AND EIGHTH ARCHBISHOP OF BALTIMORE, 1814-1887. By Sister M. Hildegarde Yeager, C.S.C. Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947. Pp. xii + 512. $4.50.

It is most gratifying to see an ever-increasing number of competent American historical craftsmen engaged in piecing together the mosaic of our national Church history. Each year witnesses the production of new scholarly monographs, histories, and articles, which fill in the gaps of our historical knowledge. While the historiographers come from many states and many dioceses, it must still be acknowledged that a very large proportion of this work has originated in the seminars of the Catholic University, under the guidance of the late Msgr. Peter Guilday and his associates and successsors.

Sister Hildegarde's biography of Archbishop Bayley is the thirty-sixth and latest of the University's "Studies in American Church History." If there is one American see whose every occupant deserves special historical attention, it is the See of Baltimore. But even apart from his career as Metropolitan, Archbishop Bayley would have merited particular study as the pioneer bishop of New Jersey. The book under review deals capably with both regimes, and with the early life of this prominent convert as well.

Some of our American prelates, such as Hughes, Bruté, England, Ireland, and McQuaid, had certain obvious traits of character which make it easy for us to get a mental picture of them. James Roosevelt Bayley, self-effacing by nature and policy, made a less positve impression on his contemporaries, in general. But those who met him and knew him found him a unique and admirable personality. "A man of charming personal

qualities, strict virtues, great kindness of heart and lavish generosity; energetic in the reformation of morals, enterprising and indefatigable; a lover of books . . . handsome and jovial, and a polished and refined gentleman. . . ." So the *New York Tribune* described him, with remarkable precision. Msgr. Thomas Preston, one of his early converts, spoke from closer acquaintance when he said of Bayley: "I have seen few men who were always so gentle and winning. . . His countenance is a memory which I love to cherish. It reflected a heart sanctified by God's grace. His gentle manner was an influence." And his coadjutor and successor, Cardinal Gibbons, who knew him better still, said: "His was the soul of honor. He never hesitated to make any sacrifice when God's will and his own conscience demanded."

As his biographer rightly observes of this man of quiet excellence, "His was an unusually full life, an interesting but not an extraordinary career." Even a person who most admires those of our church leaders who have performed more unusual feats or engaged in more clangorous battles, cannot but be attracted, in reading the present book, to the person of this convert whose faith was so secure, this mild prelate whose will was so strong, this man of honorable birth, promoted in his life to many honorable positions, who still scorned worldly honors so genuinely.

Clearly Archbishop Bayley's outstanding talents were of an administrative nature. It would be difficult to summarize his accomplishments in a review. One of his policies deserves special praise, however, particularly from historians: his insistence on the careful preservation and care of church archives. Few of his episcopal contemporaries were as solicitous over ecclesiastical records. Bayley's solicitude sprang from his cultural background and humanistic education, in which he had the advantage over most of his colleagues. Who can doubt that this attitude was largely responsible, directly or indirectly, for the preservation of many documents not only in New York, Newark, and Baltimore, but even elsewhere where the injunctions or the example of the Archbishop were followed?

At the risk of seeming ungracious, the reviewer must note some few faults which the book contains, most of them typographical. Thus on p. 49 "Chaumoni" should read "Chamonix"; on p. 68 "Kenhelm" should read "Kenelm"; on p. 246 "Messner" should read "Messmer"; on p. 358 "St. Inagoes" should read "St. Inigoes"; and the names of David Whelan and Bismarck are misspelled in the Index. Through inadvertence, "the republication" on p. 225 becomes "there publication"; "were," on p. 294, becomes "was"; "with impunity" on p. 420 becomes "without impunity." The Latin quoted in Archbishop Purcell's letter on p. 449 is garbled. By way of more positive criticism, two small points might be made. It would have been better to quote the provisions of the 1864

New Jersey incorporation law from the statutes themself (p. 208). And the Index could have been completer and more consistent, at least in the listing of Newark diocesan priests.

Except for these minor objections, it can be said that Sister Hildegarde has performed her task carefully, and reached her conclusions judiciously. She has told the whole story, told it well, and, in all likelihood, definitively.

ROBERT F. MCNAMARA

MY EVERY DAY MISSAL. By the Monks of St. Mary's Abbey, Newark, New Jersey. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1948. Pp. 36 + 1340. $0.00.

"Perhaps the greatest single compendium of Catholic belief and prayer," says Abbot Patrick O'Brien in his preface to *My Every Day Missal*, "is the missal, the prayer-book for the mass." Since the Roman missal is the world's finest prayer-book, it ought to have the widest possible distribution and use among the laity and it ought to be available in the most attractive possible form. The monks of St. Mary's Abbey in preparing and editing this new missal have certainly produced an attractive possible volume, whose distinctive features commend it to all who participate in the holy sacrifice of the Mass. They have compressed an amazing amount of material into this volume. Besides all the Masses in Latin and English for both the temporal and sanctoral cycles, votive Masses, and Masses for the dead, it contains a brief history of the Church and of the spread of the Faith, prayers Catholics say, instruction on the First Fridays observance, Forty Hours' devotion, how to use the missal, the mass vestments, and other matters. Short statements of doctrinal truths follow the Sunday masses, and a brief biography precedes each saint's feast. The scholarly liturgical explanations that introduce the seasons, the Sundays of the temporal cycle, and the feasts of our Lord and of our Lady are written for the layman rather than for the cleric, and they are not too long. The most unusual feature is the sketches of the history of the Church in each of the forty-eight states and the District of Columbia—our American heritage—which are scattered through the missal. The New Testament quotations are from the devised text of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine.

My Every Day Missal has two hundred pages more than Dom Gaspar Lefebvre's famous missal, but it is actually a little thinner because of the superior quality of the paper used. The type is large and easy to read. The printing and binding make it a work of art, and it is in the same class with Benzinger Brothers' *Missale romanum* and *Rituale romanum*.

The encouragement the Holy Father gives to the use of the missal in his recent encyclical, *Mediator Dei,* makes the publication of this beautiful book especially timely.

BONAVENTURE SCHWINN, O.S.B.

QUIZZES ON HOSPITAL ETHICS FOR NURSES, DOCTORS, PRIESTS AND SISTERS. By Rev. Dr. L. Rumble with the collaboration of Rev. Charles M. Carty. St. Paul, Minn.: Radio Replies, 1946. Pp.72.

This brief catechism of hospital ethics is intended chiefly for nurses and may be recommended for wide distribution. Its 165 questions and answers neatly summarize the personal, medical, surgical and spiritual obligations devolving upon the nurse by force of her profession. Its seven final pages of prayers, and its ready-reference index on pages three and four give added usefulness.

Its brief compass allows merely a statement of principles without explanation or proof. For the most part this is clearly and precisely done. The following points should have been more exactly formulated: q. 9 would be clearer if the word "can" were omitted; q. 37 will leave an unfortunate impression as the liberties accorded when marriage is in prospect; in q. 50 the obligation of a doctor or nurse to reveal the syphilitic condition of one contemplating marriage is not certain; he *may,* but, in practice, is not obliged to, reveal; in p. 67 reparation for inculpable mistakes is not due; in q. 81 artificial insemination between the married is not clearly forbidden; in q. 138 in giving baptism to monsters with two bodies, both bodies should be baptized conditionally and the head absolutely; in q. 148 the privilege of the sick regarding non-fasting Communion should not be restricted to *non-acoholic* liquid foods; in q.161 unconscious Catholics may be anointed absolutely; and, perhaps, the Act of Faith on p. 67 might be worded as to include explicit belief in the four truths necessary for salvation.

WALTER W. CURTIS

PRACTICAL MEDITATIONS FOR EVERY DAY IN THE YEAR ON THE LIFE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By a Father of the Society of Jesus. Revised Edition translated from the French. London and Dublin: Burns, Cates and Wasbourne, Ltd., 1946. Pp. viii + 432 + 408. $4.50.

This is a new edition of an old and popular meditation book, originally published in two volumes. It now appears in one volume of handy proportions, arranged in two parts, Part I from January to June, Part II from July to December. An informative and conveniently arranged